

JPRS-TAC-86-054

14 JULY 1986

## **Worldwide Report**

# **ARMS CONTROL**

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

14 JULY 1986

# WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

### CONTENTS

#### SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: Mid-June Reports on U.S. SDI Debates (Various sources, various dates).....	1
Increased Opposition Seen	1
Senate Subcommittee Approves	2
Weinberger Remarks Cited	2
Scientists' Petition Noted	3
Economic Burden Noted	4
Weinberger 'Pressure' on Opponents	5
USSR: June Reports on Allied Consideration of SDI (Moscow TASS, 24 Jun 86; Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 5 Jun 86)	6
FRG Companies 'Undecided'	6
FRG To Develop Antiballistic Missile	6
UK Signs Contracts With Washington	7
Growing Opposition in Japan	7
Karpov Comments on Space Arms at FRG Colloquium (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 17 Jun 86).....	9
CPSU's Dobrynin Assails SDI as Destabilizing (Anatoliy Dobrynin; Bratislava PRAVDA, 20 Jun 86).....	11

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Soviet General on 'New' Elements in Gorbachev 16 June Proposal (Mikhail Milshteyn Interview; Moscow in English to North America, 23 Jun 86).....	15
--	----

USSR: Reports on U.S. Response to Gorbachev 16 June Speech (Various sources, various dates).....	17
U.S. Studying Proposals	17
Weinberger Rejects 'Key Elements'	17
U.S. Press, Congressional Response	18
U.S. Pushed to Serious Response	19
USSR: Reagan Responds to Gorbachev Initiative in Glassboro Speech (Various sources, 21-23 Jun 86).....	20
TASS Criticizes Speech	20
Change in Stance Noted	21
NEW YORK TIMES Cited	22
USSR's Petrovskiy Addresses CD, Assails U.S. Stance (Moscow World Service, 24 Jun 86; Paris AFP, 24 Jun 86).....	23
Critical of U.S. Stand	23
Sees 'Complete' Lack of Progress	23
Soviet Interim Proposal Seeks To Break Geneva 'Standstill' (Vladimir Chernysev; Moscow TASS International Service, 17 Jun 86).....	24
TASS Military Commentator Doubts U.S. Commitment (Moscow TASS, 18 Jun 86).....	26
Soviet General Volkogonov Discusses Strategic Military Parity (Dmitriy Volkogonov; Moscow Radio Peace and Progress, 16 Jun 86).....	29
Soviet General Chervov Comments on SDI, SALT II, SS-20's (Nikolay Chervov Interview; Rome LA REPUBBLICA, 17 Jun 86)...	31
TASS Cites FRG SPD Leader on SDI, SALT II (Moscow TASS, 22 Jun 86).....	33
Moscow 'Top Priority' Panel on SALT II, ABM Treaty, SDI, INF (Moscow in English to North America, 22 Jun 86).....	34
XINHUA Calls Soviet Proposal Noteworthy 'Interim Agreement' (Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 24 Jun 86).....	38
PRC: U.S.-Soviet Arms Talks End Without Progress (Beijing XINHUA, 26 Jun 86).....	40
Beijing Review: Arms Race Seen Still on Grueling Course (Peng Di; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 25, 23 Jun 86).....	41



Soviet Chief of Staff on Japanese SDI Role, SS-20's (Akhromeyev Interview; Tokyo NHK Television Network, 11 Jun 86).....	43
--	----

#### SALT/START ISSUES

PRC Journal Views U.S.-Soviet Dispute Over SALT II (Shi Lujia; Beijing LIAOWANG, No 24, 16 Jun 86).....	45
XINHUA: U.S. Strategic Goal Seeks To Hinder USSR Development (Mei Zhenmin; Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 25 Jun 86)...	48

#### INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Moscow Discusses French Nuclear Arms Before Mitterand's Visit (Moscow in French to France and Belgium, 13 Jun 86).....	50
PRAVDA Stresses Importance of British, French Nuclear Arms (Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Jun 86).....	52
Moscow on U.S. Deployments in Japan (Moscow Television Service, 17 Jun 86; Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 20 Jun 86).....	55
Okinawa Exercise	55
F-16's to Misawa	56
Briefs	
TASS on 'Tomahawk' Test	58

#### CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S. Continuing 'Secret' CW Research (Moscow TASS, 17 Jun 86).....	59
TASS: U.S. Turning 'Blind Eye' to Leaking Chemical Weapons Depots (Moscow TASS, 11 Jun 86).....	60
TASS: Press Conference at USIA Seeks To Justify U.S. CW Buildup (Moscow TASS, 13 Jun 86).....	61
Moscow TV Discusses CW Dangers to FRG (Moscow Television Service, 22 Jun 86).....	62
IZVESTIYA Notes Spanish TV Show on U.S., UK CBW Research (V. Vernikov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 16 Apr 86).....	65
USSR: Chemical Weapons Seminar Sponsored by Dutch Government (Moscow TASS, 4, 6 Jun 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 6 Jun 86).....	68
Seminar Opens	68
European Opposition to CW Noted	68
Verification Discussed	69

FRG Agrees With U.S. on Chemical Weapons (Hamburg DPA, 15 May 86; Hamburg ARD Television Network, 15 May 86).....	70
Government Defends NATO Vote	70
Woerner Comments	71
FRG Paper Cites NATO Concern About Bonn's Possible Veto Right (Bonn DIE WELT, 13 May 86).....	73
FRG Newspaper Comments on NATO CBW Decision (Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 23 May 86).....	74
USSR's Israelyan Speaks on Chemical Weapons (Various sources, various dates).....	75
Press Conference at CD	75
In Bonn With Kvitsinskiy	75
British-Soviet Talks	76
Briefs	
Security Council Decision	77
U.S. To Withdraw Chemical Weapons	77
FRG Denies Upgrading Chemical Weapons	77
EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
BEIJING REVIEW: Warsaw Pact Proposal Timely (Xin Zong; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 25, 23 Jun 86).....	78
NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS	
USSR: U.S. Plans 25 June Nevada Test (Moscow TASS, 25 Jun 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 24 Jun 86).	80
TASS Report	80
'Staking on Sheer Force'	81
PRAVDA: U.S. Blocking Creation of Southeast Asia NFZ (Dmitriy Kosyrev; Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Apr 86).....	82
USSR: North Korea Proposes Nuclear-Free Peninsula (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 24 Jun 86; Moscow World Service, 24, 25 June 86).....	84
Government Statement Cited	84
U.S. Response Viewed	84
PRC in Favor	85
Briefs	
SPD/SED Talks	86

## RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA on Gorbachev Geneva Proposals, Warsaw Pact Appeal (Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Jun 86).....	87
USSR: U.S. Administration Should Heed 'Lessons' of War (A. Leontyev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 21 Jun 86).....	90
Soviet Military Paper on U.S. SSBN, Surface Naval Programs (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 14 Jun 86).....	92
Moscow Commentary on Different Disarmament Approaches (Moscow Television Service, 17 Jun 86).....	95
Moscow, China Vow No-First-Use of Nuclear Weapons (Moscow in Mandarin to China, 14 Jun 86).....	96
TASS: Carrington Pressures Norway on SDI, Arms Spending, NFZ (Moscow TASS, 24 Jun 86).....	98
Soviet Scientists on Nuclear War Effects on Biosphere (Vladimir Lvov; Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 4 Apr 86)...	99

/6539

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### USSR: MID-JUNE REPORTS ON U.S. SDI DEBATES

#### Increased Opposition Seen

PM121501 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel I. Nikolayev article: "Seeing the Light...? Opposition to the 'Star Wars' Program Growing in the United States"]

[Text] The U.S. Congress has resumed discussion of the draft federal budget for fiscal 1987. The administration's demand for appropriations for implementing the "Strategic Defense Initiative" to be increased 77 percent has aroused a storm of passions both inside and outside Congress. The amounts being demanded for this purpose are truly astronomic -- the Pentagon's budget request for fiscal 1987, confirmed by the President, stands at \$5.4 billion.

Such excessive appetites of the military-industrial complex have aroused stubborn resistance even among those who have never before objected to the acceleration of war preparations. In a recent letter to the Senate Armed Services Committee, 46 senators of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties voiced "alarm in connection with the fact that the Defense Department budget provides for inordinate and unjustified appropriations to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative."

One of the most remarkable theses in this letter is the clear admission that "the holding of flight tests within the SDI framework will be a violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty."

Other congressmen have supported the initiative of the group of senators. As C. Bennett, member of the House Armed Services Committee, declared, he not only approves the senator's letter but also intends to set up an analogous group in the House of Representatives to freeze appropriations for SDI.

The U.S. Administration is not all cheered by the prospects of the Senate and the House of Representatives pooling their efforts. The congressmen's actions are regarded as one of the most serious actions against SDI since that program was made public.

Opposition to the "star wars" program is also spreading among American scientists. A majority of the professorial staff in the physics faculties of 20 of the country's leading universities have declared that they do not support SDI and will not accept any funds allocated for research within its framework. These scientists include 15 Nobel Prize winners.

As Prof (Dzh. Kogut) of the University of Illinois declared, more than 6,500 U.S. scientists have signed "an official statement of nonparticipation in SDI." Just 80 scientists in the United States have come out (or, rather, been forced to come out) in favor of research under the "star wars" program. An eloquent ratio, let us state bluntly: more than 80 "cons" for every "pro."

The administration's efforts to justify in the eyes of the public the policy of militarizing space by citing such old and repeatedly exposed "arguments" as White House spokesman L. Speakes uses, for example, appear pitiful. He claims that SDI was "a positive factor which contributed to the start of arms talks."

As increasingly wide public circles recognize the true essence of SDI, their understanding of its aggressive thrust is growing. Under these conditions apologists for "star wars" are finding it increasingly hard to conceal their true intentions of achieving military superiority over the USSR and its allies and trying to resolve the historic dispute between socialism and capitalism by military means.

#### Senate Subcommittee Approves

LD132149 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 13 Jun (TASS)--The Senate subcommittee on strategic and theatre nuclear forces voted for \$4.1 billion on continued "star wars" preparations in fiscal 1987. In addition to this money, appropriated for the Pentagon to develop components of a large partially space-based ABM system, the Department of Energy, concerned with the development of advanced nuclear weapons, including nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers, will get another \$400 million. The administration has thus kept its request for funds virtually intact in the first congressional vote on "star wars" spending next fiscal year.

#### Weinberger Remarks Cited

LD182220 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 18 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS) -- TASS commentator Leonid Ponomarev writes: U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger in one of his recent meetings with journalists said that in the framework of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program, 99 percent of efforts are directed at the possibility of destroying Soviet nuclear missiles the moment they are launched. He even assured listeners that the Washington administration is much less interested in "the defense" of its nuclear potential than in the destruction of Soviet missiles "by any means."

This pronouncement by Pentagon's boss bears witness to the fact that U.S. leaders, however much they deny it, direct their strategy at making a first nuclear strike and at the destruction of Soviet missiles on Soviet territory. The whole complex of weapons systems being created within the SDI framework is subjected to this task, more widely known as the "star wars" program.

THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper reports, for example, that at the Livermore laboratory and at its test site in Nevada intensive work is being done to create a ray weapon, for which a nuclear explosion in space close to earth will serve as the source of energy. Such a weapon is being prepared despite the fact that putting into space nuclear means, their siting and explosions in space are prohibited by specific accords. There is no doubt whatsoever that as soon as the United States creates this weapon it will discard the aforementioned accords, just as today it is discarding SALT II, which interferes with the future growth of the U.S. nuclear potential. Even the names of the types of bombs being devised according to the Pentagon's orders indicates that the whole policy, the whole U.S. military strategy is subjected to the idea of a first strike. Here are the names: "Electromagnetic impulse bomb," "an optical laser bomb," "a gamma-ray bomb" and others.

Acknowledged even by American specialists, all the new weapons can be used "for fulfilling an innumerable quantity of tasks" and not only for "defense" as the Washington administration asserts.

In other words the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is a very serious escalation in the arms race. The other side is naturally not going to look on calmly as Washington speeds up the growth of its strike potential.

However now, while there is still time, the Soviet Union proposes to reach an accord with the United States on not departing from the Soviet-U.S. treaty on antimissile defense for at least 15 years, while limiting work in the sphere of SDI to the level of research -- a threshold which the United States has in fact approached. Insofar as the Soviet Union will by no means allow the United States nuclear missile superiority, then the best thing is to try to reach agreement on ending the arms race now and to do so honestly and reliably.

#### Scientists' Petition Noted

LD192021 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 19 Jun (TASS)--The development of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), known as the "star wars" program, "represents a significant escalation of the arms race and runs the serious risk of jeopardizing existing arms control treaties and future negotiations," says a letter to President Ronald Reagan, signed by 1,600 American scientists.

The petition was delivered to a news conference in the American capital today, the ASSOCIATED PRESS reported, as a warning to President Reagan who was seeking to expand SDI spending within the brief period.

Last year, for instance, the AP observed, Reagan asked Congress to approve a total of \$4.17 billion in government spending on SDI, while this year, he was seeking \$5.4 billion.

The news conference was sponsored by Senators Bennett Johnston and Dan Evans, who had put together a coalition of 48 senators opposing further increases in the "star wars" budget.



14 July 1986

Daniel Fisher, an organizer of the petition drive, said SDI "has aroused an unprecedented level of concern among the scientific and technical community in this country... yet the administration does not seem to have listened to the very engineers and scientists upon whom President Reagan called to lead the effort to develop a shield against nuclear attack."

Another organizer, John Backus, said that a computer program to operate a "star wars" defense would be "vast, complex and subject to errors."

"I consider it impossible to produce a complete reliable battle program," Backus concluded.

#### Economic Burden Noted

LD241848 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS -- by TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Three years and a half following Ronald Reagan's proclamation of the "star wars" programs, the "Christmas wrapping" has fallen off his promise to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" with the help of a space-based anti-missile defence system.

The undermining by Washington of the latest strategic arms limitation treaty commitments and the White House's refusal to suspend nuclear testing highlighted the American Administration's attitude to problems of war and peace.

American experts convincingly prove that the large-scale anti-missile defence, currently being developed in the U.S. will at best be an umbrella with a hole in it, that could protect against a drizzle, but not against the missile torrent -- a counter strike at the aggressor.

Nonetheless, the U.S. Administration stubbornly rejects Soviet proposals for preventing the militarization of outer space for strict compliance with the 1972 Soviet-American ABM Treaty.

What is the true purpose of the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative of the U.S.?

By seeking to attain military superiority through the "star wars" programme, the present administration is seeking to involve the Soviet Union into costly space adventures and wear it out economically.

American experts estimated in the seventies that developing an anti-missile defence would cost 4-5 times more than the development by the other side of offensive missiles capable of overcoming it.

Edward Teller, the "father of the hydrogen bomb" and dyed-in-the-wool supporter of the cold and the shooting war, claimed, apparently referring to the economic consequences of the space arms race for the Soviet Union, that if the USSR followed the American example and started devising its own large-scale space-based anti-missile defence system, the SDI effort would be justified.



14 July 1986

It seems that Washington's "cold warriors" fear the successful implementation of the Soviet economic plans far more than the "threat" posed by Soviet missiles.

Indeed, SDI enables Washington to oblige the U.S. military-industrial elite and help it to profit from unprecedented military orders. This is one of the chief causes of the piling up of new American weapons.

It is likely that the Reagan administration will allow the monopolies to capitalize on the "star wars" plans at the expense of American tax-payers. This is well within its powers.

The situation is different in what concerns foreign policy aspects of the "star wars" plans. The Soviet leaders, referring to scientific developments, repeatedly pointed out that the USSR's response to the development in the U.S. of a large-scale anti-missile system with space-based elements would be effective, less expensive and could be carried out within a shorter period.

The response would not be necessarily in outer space.

At present already, the existing systems, including submarine-launched low-flying missiles, cruise and so on, make it possible to neutralize effectively any anti-missile defence.

The calculations currently being made in Washington are doomed to failure. White House strategists erroneously believe that in ensuring its security, the Soviet Union will follow the American scenario.

On the other hand, the real multi-billion budgets allocated for the development of the unreliable umbrella for the U.S. may exacerbate the real problems of U.S. security and economy.

#### Weinberger 'Pressure' on Opponents

LD240932 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 24 TASS - TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lavrentiev reports:

The U.S. Administration is putting pressure on the opponents of the "star wars" program in a bid to win larger appropriations for SDI development projects and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger's speech at a conference of the U.S. space foundation was the latest effort in this pressure campaign.

Although the agenda of the conference dealt with future space programs, his speech was devoted almost entirely to the need to carry on SDI research and development and to secure appropriations for the purpose. Weinberger actually reduced the exploration of outer space to its militarization. To bring his view home, he did not even shrink from exploiting the memory of the crew killed in the Challenger disaster.

Weinberger actually admitted that the administration's goal today was not only continued research but also the development of components for a major partially space-based ABM system. The secretary demagogically claimed that SDI weapons should first be deployed to decide if they were destabilizing.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1443

USSR: JUNE REPORTS ON ALLIED CONSIDERATION OF SDI

FRG Companies 'Undecided'

LD241138 Moscow TASS in English 0841 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn June 24 TASS -- Normally West German corporate giants never miss a chance of cashing in on the arms race. However many of them, including such pillars of the military-industrial complex, as Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm, Dill and Dornier, are still undecided whether it is expedient for them to participate in the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative", the SPIEGEL magazine reported quoting a classified document of the West German Government.

West German capital is unhappy, above all, at the fettering U.S.-dictated terms for such participation and slim prospects of getting profit, although Americans promised wonders to European companies.

West German firms and concerns are in no hurry to join the SDI, despite Bonn's painstaking efforts to thrust the participation in sinister "star wars" plans on the West German business community.

Upon returning from Washington where he had signed secret agreements with the U.S. on Bonn's part in the realization of the SDI, West German Economics Minister Martin Bangemann (Free Democratic Party) told newsmen that the government expected about 50 to 60 companies to participate in that program.

However, SPIEGEL writes, since "there isn't as much as a hint on easy profit", the interest of the West German business community in "star wars" is "at a minimum." So far two companies and one research center in West Germany took small orders from overseas. These are Schott and Zeiss, the optics manufacturers, and the University of Frankfurt am Main.

FRG To Develop Antiballistic Missile

LD241443 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn June 24 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov reports:

The West German Government has appropriated several billion marks to develop a surface-to-air missile intended to counter not only planes and cruise missiles but also ballistic missiles, Hans Ruehl, planning chief at the General Staff of the West German Defense Ministry, announced at a NATO conference in Kiel. The conference was devoted to the fulfillment of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner had earlier reached agreement on the establishment of a U.S.-West German working group to concern itself with the development of such a missile. According to Ruehl, the new project should enable West Germany to leave behind the stage at which it was a U.S. minor partner in rocket building.

The West German corporations Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm and Dornier have already joined a number of American and British companies in the development of a long-range cruise missile, which, according to press reports, will be able to carry either conventional or nuclear warheads.

#### UK Signs Contrar : With Washington

LD250903 Moscow TASS in English 2159 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] London June 25 TASS -- The United States and Britain signed a series of contracts on Britain's practical involvement in research on the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan. A respective agreement on this was concluded in Washington between Caspar Weinberger U.S. secretary of defence, and George Younger, head of the British Military establishment, now on a visit in the United States, the BBC news service reported.

Britain is known to be the first of Washington's partners to back the idea of translating into like the notorious "star wars" programme of the U.S. Administration and signed with it a corresponding "Memorandum on Mutual Understanding" providing for drawing British firms into research under the SDI project.

#### Growing Opposition in Japan

OW060831 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Pavel Potapov report]

[Text] A campaign is spreading in Japan to oppose the country's participation in a dangerous scheme called the Star Wars plan. Radio Moscow correspondent in Tokyo, Pavel Potapov, makes the following report on this campaign:

A signature-collecting campaign is now spreading across the country to appeal to the Government not to participate in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative in whatever form. This campaign is initiated by a group of young teachers and students at the Physics Department of Hiroshima University. Mr Sako Matsui, a graduate student and representative of this group, says: It is our responsibility to prevent Japan from participating in [word indistinct] U.S. schemes which lead to a fiercer arms race and its expansion to outer space.

Teachers and students at 20 universities have thus far expressed their support for this appeal. The Science Council of Japan has also been actively participating in this campaign. It has recently adopted its second appeal, calling on the government to advocate opposition to the U.S. Star Wars plan, making the best use of Japan's international prestige. The Science

Council of Japan has also published a pamphlet entitled "What Is the SDI?" In this pamphlet, Japanese physicists said: The aim of the study related to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative is quite clear. The Strategic Defense Initiative is a dangerous scheme, which will lead scientific research in a totally outrageous direction.

What worries the democratic forces most is the conservative government's position. The government said, with increasing emphasis, that Japan may participate in research on the Strategic Defense Initiative. It is trying to draw a rosy picture of the U.S. plan by trumpeting its merits.

The peace forces in Japan have been stepping up their opposition to the Star Wars plan and nuclear weapons, while exposing this tactic by the Liberal Democratic Party.

Opposition to space militarization is also one of the central slogans of those who are participating in an ongoing peace march on Hiroshima, an annual event.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1443

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

KARPOV COMMENTS ON SPACE ARMS AT FRG COLLOQUIUM

PM171131 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Bovkon report under the rubric "Izvestiya Interview": "Concrete Steps are Needed"]

[Excerpts] Loccum -- An international seminar on space weapons was held in the small town of Loccum in Lower Saxony on the initiative of the evangelical academy. Taking part were prominent military experts and public and political figures from the Soviet Union, the United States, Denmark, the Netherlands, the GDR, the FRG, and other countries.

After the colloquium, I asked V.P. Karpov, leader of the USSR's delegation at the Geneva talks on space and nuclear arms, to share his impressions on the character of the discussions at Loccum.

[Karpov] Above all, they reflected the very keen interest of broad circles of the Western public on the problem of freeing mankind from the danger of an arms race in space. The majority of the participants, in my opinion, had an absolutely clear idea of where the path to a peaceful space lies. The discussion confirmed the marked contrast between the positions of the USSR and the United States. Our initiatives, in particular the proposal formulated in the letter from N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to J. Perez de Cuellar, demonstrate the Soviet Union's serious commitment to the peaceful utilization of space, and not simply commitment, but willingness to share its achievements and create the material and other conditions for broad international cooperation in this sphere. The United States gambles on creating an extremely destabilizing class of arms, which would lead to consequences difficult to foresee. The introduction of qualitatively new means into the structure of strategic forces would change the entire system of evaluation of the strategic balance, increase the risk of tension and uncertainty in the world, and intensify mutual suspicion, undermining strategic stability. As a result, the security of states would be decreased sharply, and the arms control process would reach an impasse.

Authoritative scientists, including American ones, call into question the possibility of creating a 100 percent impenetrable 'antimissile shield.' One or two breaches in the antimissile armor will negate the effectiveness of the entire system. In the pursuit of the chimera of absolute invulnerability, years will be wasted, time which could have been used for the cause of disarmament. Many people in the FRG understand this. One feels that West Germans are alarmed by the foolhardy U.S. course, and by many aspects of it at that.

The American President's decision not to observe SALT II and to produce binary weapons, and in particular the behavior of the U.S. delegation at the Bern conference of experts on contacts between people, convinced many people that Europe is a matter of indifference to the United States. One could sense the concern about the future of the Stockholm conference. If only the same result does not emerge there as in Bern.

At the same time the discussion showed that along with the problem of security in general, everyone is now worried by the question: What can be done first and foremost in order to achieve real results along the path of disarmament? There is no doubt that this desire for concrete deeds explains the growing interest in the USSR's peace proposals.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1443



SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CPSU'S DOBRYNIN ASSAILS SDI AS DESTABILIZING

AU240836 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 20 Jun 86 p 6

[Article by Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: "For a Nuclear-Free World, Toward the 21st Century"]

[Text] Never before has science played such an important role in society, never before has the fate of civilization depended on it to such an extent -- in essence, the questions of mankind's life and death.

No one can avoid the decision about how these immense forces, awakened by human genius, will be utilized further. Just as no one can lay claim to having a monopoly, an exclusive right to decide the fate of the human community. Since Albert Einstein's times, most prominent representatives of science have been saying that no one can divest himself of responsibility in these issues -- especially not scientists.

I think that, apart from lunatic gamblers, no one will deny the destructive consequences of a nuclear catastrophe in the current situation. This, although it is strange, gives many a feeling of security -- allegedly no one will permit the unleashing of a nuclear war. Afterall, people do not want to commit suicide. It would be a great mistake to believe this. The current feverish arms buildup creates a completely new situation -- it mercilessly shortens the time in which one can make decisions, it increasingly leaves decisionmaking to machines and technology, and thus, step by step, it deprives politicians of the right to assess, discuss, and consider. Well, technology, even technology that has been tried and tested many times, can fail at times. This is attested to by the destruction of the Challenger space shuttle, the explosions of the Titan and Delta rockets, the accident in the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, and many other similar cases. One day this could be the ultimate end. Is it, perhaps, possible to permit such a risk?

Occasionally one also hears the following assertion: The threat of universal nuclear destruction is the key stabilizing factor in the current system of international relations; allegedly it has an inevitable containing influence on political representatives; it forces them to weigh every step carefully and avoid ill-considered actions. Therefore, nuclear disarmament -- these representatives think -- would necessarily lead to the escalation of international tension and would increase the number of conflicts employing conventional weapons. From this arises the conclusion that "historical logic" and "common sense" allegedly require the preservation of the existing nuclear arsenals.



Such contemplations will not stand up to comparison with the lessons of history. Weapons on their own have never played a "peace-making role." No new weapon has eliminated war, it has always added destructive potential to them.

Not one of the military inventions to date has imperiled the existence of mankind. Such a threat came into being only after the invention of nuclear weapons. But where is the guarantee that in strained crisis situations this threat will always be an effective factor of containment and will avert what cannot be corrected? Such a guarantee does not and cannot exist.

One also has to bear in mind that during the entire "nuclear century" the Western countries have not shown any political prudence and restraint at all. The United States has more than once tried to make use of the nuclear weapons as an instrument of military-political blackmail, a matter that has occasionally brought the world to the verge of nuclear catastrophe. The fact that a nuclear war has not been unleashed in these 4 postwar decades is not at all due to the "containment" power of nuclear weapons. Here, to a certain extent, the reason of politicians, and to an even greater extent the endeavor of peace-loving states, and the growth of the mass antiwar movement played their role. To a certain extent "lady luck" also played a role.

The world -- more than satiated with nuclear warheads (in the 4 postwar decades their number has risen from 2 units to 50,000 units) and their carriers, military helicopters and reconnaissance offensive complexes, nuclear submarines and naval battle vessels can be compared with a lunatic sitting on a powder keg playing with matches. In such conditions, peace can neither be reliable nor firm.

The development of new weapons by one side forces the other side to undertake retaliatory measures while considering the worst variant of the development of events. And that, again, has an influence on the party that started the new round of feverish arms buildup. Thus, the vicious circle closes. Feverish arms buildup acquires its own inertia, its own perverted logic of development, and brings us close to a threshold beyond which it can become uncontrollable and irreversible.

This fact becomes very clear when we take into consideration the qualitative aspect of feverish arms buildup. It constitutes a nonsensical chase after a "miraculous weapon," which will bring long-expected security -- a vain chase, but bringing the threat of nuclear catastrophe, the more so since the hope of that "miracle" could encourage some representatives to adventurism and the endeavor to achieve "strategic superiority," and later even to attempts to implement it.

The "Strategic Defense Initiative" program, implemented by the Reagan administration, is a great danger to maintaining peace and to the stability of the military-strategic equilibrium. If we are to believe the advocates of "star wars, Washington needs the "space shield" only to avert the threat of a first strike by the Soviet Union, to consolidate the strategic stability, and even to rid the world of nuclear weapons. But those who are taking part in the elaboration of American foreign policy must know that the Soviet Union unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and that this pledge has become an integral component of its military doctrine; the PRC has also adopted the same pledge. If the United States, and after it France and Great Britain, were to follow their example, the issue of a first strike would cease to be topical in many respects.

The attempt to pass off the strategic Defense Initiative as an instrument for the consolidation of strategic stability, also, will not stand up to criticism. Exactly the opposite is the consequence. The creation of the "space shield," under the aegis of which some American strategists are trying to gain the potential of a scot-free, disarming nuclear strike, would lead to a profound upset in the existing equilibrium of forces, to the total destruction of the main foundations on which the strategic stability rests, and to the acceleration of the feverish arms buildup in the sphere of offensive as well as defensive strategic weapons.

The appeal to all scientists of the world, which Soviet scientists published in April 1983, states that "in a nuclear war there exist no effective means of defense, and developing them is practically impossible." This appeal also stresses: "In reality, the attempt to develop so-called defensive weapons against the other side's strategic nuclear forces, a matter about which the U.S. President talks, will inevitably result in another element that will magnify the American 'first-strike' potential.

It is no coincidence that at present the practical activity of the U.S. Administration concentrates on an accelerated development of precisely this potential. Such a 'defensive weapon' can give practically nothing to a country against which an unexpected extensive attack is aimed, because it is incapable of saving the major part of the population. Making use of antimissile weapons is most favorable for the attacking side which strives to reduce the force of a retaliatory strike. However, it cannot avert such a retaliatory strike completely."

Today, as we know, thousands of scientists from all countries share such a view, including a great number of scientists and experts in the United States, the FRG, Great Britain, Australia, and Canada.

We are not opposing feverish space armament because we fear that we cannot bear the rivalry foisted on us. Today, more than ever, we have at our disposal both sufficient knowledge, and mature experience and resources to ward off, in the best possible way, any further American step toward supremacy. As was stated by Mikhail Gorbachev, who referred to the works of our scientists, the Soviet reply to the U.S. establishment of an extensive antimissile system using space-based elements will be more effective and cheaper, and perhaps it will even be realized quicker; at the same time, it is not certain that this reply will take place in space. For instance, an extensive set of possible measures and means of resisting space arms is mentioned in the research and lectures of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against Nuclear War.

The advocates of the Strategic Defense Initiative are using as an argument -- aimed, above all, at the scientific community -- the allegation that this program would ensure a radical new turn in the sphere of technologies and provide an incentive for the development of scientific thinking. But is not the human mind, including scientific thinking, predestined to be capable of foreseeing the consequences of activity, and of averting them if they are deadly? And is it really possible to achieve progress in science and technology solely by subordinating them to military goals?

On the contrary: Peaceful goals open the greatest scope for scientific research and for the utilization of its results, all for the benefit of man. It is because of this that the Soviet stand is not limited merely to unmasking the "star wars" plans and probing their murderous nature. It contains an important alternative and constructive element -- peaceful cooperation in space research. I recall that this is exactly what Mikhail Gorbachev was talking about at the meeting with the delegation of the congress of Nobel Prize winners, where he stressed that in principle we are in favor of taking a different road toward the acceleration of progress in science and technology.

Regarding space research, the USSR has proposed the setting up of an appropriate world-wide organization, which would be the center for coordinating efforts in this undertaking of universal scope. This concerns both basic scientific research and the launching of interplanetary spaceships with this aim in mind, for instance to Mars. It also concerns the utilization of the results of space research in the spheres of biology, medicine, materials science, weather forecasting, climate and environment research, and so forth. Finally, it also concerns the joint development of new space technology and its use in the interest of all mankind.

The main reliable instrument for consolidating strategic stability and reducing the danger of war would be the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, the prevention of feverish armament in space, and the transition to realistic measures aimed at disarmament. It is necessary to agree, in an honest and businesslike manner, on specific measures for reducing and later eliminating the threat of a nuclear war. It is necessary to reach this agreement before it is too late.

The Soviet Union attributes great significance to the growing cooperation of scientists in various countries in the fight against the nuclear threat.

This cooperation has already succeeded in filling millions of people with enthusiasm. We know that such problems as the global consequences of a nuclear war, the "nuclear winter," the issues of averting feverish armament in space, the danger of a nuclear conflict breaking out by pure chance, and so forth have become the object of extensive research not only by Soviet scientists, but also by a broad circle of scientists from other countries, including the United States. On the basis of the Soviet scientists' contacts with many social organizations broad, such research work has become international and in many instances it has made it possible to formulate the stand adopted by the world scientific public, which is capable of influencing the course of events.

We trust that scientists in all countries will multiply their forces, and that in the future they will also stand among the vanguard fighters for mankind's survival, for mankind's happiness and future.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1443

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET GENERAL ON 'NEW' ELEMENTS IN GORBACHEV 16 JUNE PROPOSAL

LD241635 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 23 Jun 86

[Interview with USSR General Mikhail Milshteyn -- not further identified -- by unidentified correspondent, date and place not given]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] What is new in the proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev?

[Milshteyn] If the United States agrees to adhere to the ABM Treaty at least for 15 years we have nothing against research limited by laboratories. That's something new. Second, we are speaking about equal levels of the strategic forces, the ICBM's, SLBM's and strategic bombers. It is not a final proposition, it's intermediate proposition from the way of [as heard] 50 percent reductions, we're interested to have radical reduction of strategic nuclear forces, but as long as the United States is not ready we're proposing intermediate solving this problem and in this connection we are ready to sign such a treaty, but at the same time it should be considered as a step on the road of drastic reduction in the near future, as it was proposed somehow by both sides, because the United States proposed 50 percent reduction and the Soviet Union proposed 50 percent reduction. The only thing is, there is a difference in what should be counted as a 50 percent.

As far as the United States is concerned, it reminds me of such an example. If you take, for instance, a heavyweight boxing contest and two heavyweight boxers are going to fight. One, is the, for instance, just for the sake of example, one is the Soviet boxer who is right-handed and the American boxer is left-handed. American side: the proposition looks like the proposition from the American boxer if it would be like this: he proposed, listen, that the right hand is a very dangerous, one because (?you normally) make great drama or whatever it is, so let's fight on a peaceful basis, let's fight with only left hand, not saying that he is left-handed and as far as the right hand is concerned, let's (?tie) it and fight only with left hand. So, sometimes the substance of the American propositions looks like the proposition of this symbolic heavyweight boxer.

[Correspondent] The Soviet side rejects the current American proposals made in Geneva. Why is this?

[Milshteyn] They count only missiles or warheads, they don't count cruise missiles, they don't count bombers, they don't count a very great component of their triad. So, but the SALT I agreement and SALT II agreement cover all three components of the strategic forces. So there couldn't be an agreement on the American platform. There could be only agreement if each side, that the Soviet side take into consideration security not only of its own security, it cannot be achieved, an agreement if one side takes into consideration of the security only of one side. [sentence as heard] There could be an agreement only on the basis of common security, and as far as the Soviet Union is concerned we are ready to take that into consideration. We are making many steps (?on) half way toward the United States.

[Correspondent] General, many American politicians allege that the more powerful the United States gets the more likely will concessions be made on the part of the Soviet Union at the talks on arms reduction and control. What is your view?

[Nilshteyn] There are many naive -- I would call them naive if they wouldn't be dangerous -- opinions like this: The tougher the United States in its behavior the more concessions will be made by the Soviet Union. It's very dangerous because it will lead only to the arms race, because the Soviet Union will not make any concessions which will harm its national security.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1441



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: REPORTS ON U.S. RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV 16 JUNE SPEECH

U.S. Studying Proposals

PM191310 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 86 First Edition p 6

[Roundup of 18 June reports by own correspondents O. Losoto and I. Tarutin and TASS: "Socialism and Peace Are Indivisible"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union is fully determined to continue to advance confidently along the path of the country's socioeconomic development and persistently implement its peace-loving initiatives. This theme is stressed in the widespread international reactions to the results of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum.

Washington

Addressing journalists, a White House spokesman stated that Washington is studying the Soviet proposals in the arms control sphere. In this context THE WASHINGTON POST notes that within the administration there are disagreements between those who would like to continue the present course and those who believe that the Soviet peace initiatives "may provide a basis for fruitful talks."

Weinberger Rejects 'Key Elements'

LD200952 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] The United States Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, has rejected some key elements of a new Soviet arms control proposal dealing with space weapons. Here are some details:

Mr Weinberger said he opposes any moves that would prevent the United States from withdrawing from the ABM Treaty. The Soviet Union has proposed that the two countries abide by this treaty for at least 15 more years, while SDI research be restricted to laboratory work. Simultaneously, the Soviet Union and the United States could cut their strategic forces, that is land- and sea-based ICBMs and bombers, to equal levels, whereas medium-range weapons capable of reaching the territory of the other side, including long-range cruise missiles, could be dealt with separately. True, this country would prefer a radical, 50 percent, cut in the strategic offensive arms but we could settle for an interim offer if it helps to open up new prospects for an onward movement in arms control.

Having said "no" to key elements of the Soviet offer on keeping the SBI down to laboratory work, the Pentagon couldn't do better in explaining where the White House stands. First of all, the 1972 ABM Treaty is most likely to become its next victim following the SALT II treaty. Without killing the ABM Treaty the rout of the Soviet-American arms control and disarmament structure would be incomplete. And secondly, in the near future we can expect another flare-up of anti-Soviet rhetoric to justify the abandonment of the ABM Treaty by the United States.

That was the case with the killing of SALT II and it is going to be the same with the ABM accord.

On one hand the White House is poisoning the political climate in bilateral relations. On the other hand it has been urging a new summit as a vital means of improving them. We know that life is full of paradoxes, but there has to be a limit.

#### U.S. Press, Congressional Response

PH230959 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 86 First Edition p 6

[Own correspondent G. Vasilyev report: "Main Theme"]

[Text] New York, 18 Jun -- The report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum is one of the main themes in the U.S. press, radio, and television broadcasts. In their dispatches from Moscow, correspondents of leading U.S. newspapers are covering different provisions of the report, highlighting these sections that talk about the Soviet proposals aimed at curbing the arms race and preventing nuclear catastrophe. "Mikhail Gorbachev," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "has announced the new Soviet proposals on arms limitation according to which the Russians agree to reduce the arsenals of strategic armaments if the United States limit its plans for the deployment of weapons in space to research work and agrees to abide by the 1972 ABM Treaty for at least 15 more years."

THE WASHINGTON POST highlights M.S. Gorbachev's point that the Soviet Union has taken new steps to promote the search for mutually acceptable accords at the Geneva talks. If the U.S. side ignores the Soviet initiatives this time too, it will be clear to the whole world that the current U.S. Administration is engaged in an unworthy game in one of the gravest issues on which mankind's future depends.

The news of Moscow's new peace proposals came at a time of emerging confrontation here on important issues of U.S. foreign and military policy. The Pentagon's resumption of nuclear explosions at the Nevada test range and President Reagan's declared intention to begin dismantling existing Soviet-U.S. accords are arousing concern and protest among many people. Representatives of the mass antiwar organizations, politicians, labor union leaders, and prominent religious figures are opposing the course of an unrestrained arms race.

The debate is also flaring up on Capitol Hill. Recently the House Foreign Affairs Committee submitted a resolution urging the President to abide by the SALT II framework. A similar resolution will soon be submitted for a vote to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Joseph Biden, a cosponsor of this document, has stated that U.S. policy has "fallen into the hands of a clique of right-wing radicals who have long been trying



14 July 1986

to wreck the entire control structure." In the legislator's words, the efforts of these people from the military-industrial complex are seriously harming the interests of the U.S. people themselves. In the very near future there will be a vote on the draft resolution submitted by Representative Patricia Schroeder. It envisages an end to the funding of U.S. underground nuclear tests if the U.S. Administration does not take up the Soviet moratorium.

The USSR's new peace initiatives, as set out at the CPSU Central Committee plenum, are being perceived by sensible Americans as evidence that the people of the world have a real way to prevent war and consolidate international security.

### U.S. Pushed to Serious Response

LD221806 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 22 Jun 86

[From "International Panorama" presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Excerpt] If countries combine their efforts for the sake of constructive aims and do not scatter or squander these efforts for the sake of hostile aims, it would be possible to not only move mountains, but to remake the planet. In recent times our country has made new, bold proposals on disarmament. This is the time to remind you that previously Soviet proposals were almost automatically not taken seriously from the word go. It was usually said that they were not serious proposals, but mere propaganda. However, there are now present two political forces that, like a strong cross wind, are pushing the U.S. Administration off its former, completely negative positions. These are its allies in battle, who are far less militantly inclined, and its own public, which has its doubts over the rationality and usefulness of military rivalry. As a result, the Soviet proposals are not now being met with hostility in Washington, as had been the case, but almost with a welcome, with expansive expressions concerning serious study of such proposals.

For example, it has been officially announced that the Soviet intermediate version on strategic arms is being considered with all seriousness. The question is also being asked regarding the seriousness of the Soviet side. For example, Vice President George Bush says: Let us hope that the Soviets are seriously inclined; if they are so inclined, they will find in the United States a serious interlocutor.

Surely our concrete, flexible initiatives that take into account the other side's misgivings seem invented, surely our proposals are evidence that we are seriously inclined. It could be added that we have a feeling of responsibility for the fate of the world.

It is Washington in fact with its militaristic passion that lacks seriousness in this most serious of issues. For it is so important to be serious now. This is a matter of the fate of our civilization that is usually -- although not always with complete justification -- associated primarily with Europe. Much was destroyed in Europe in the last war.

/9738

CS0: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: REAGAN RESPONDS TO GORBACHEV INITIATIVE IN GLASSBORO SPEECH

TASS Criticizes Speech

PM230832 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

["Concerning a Speech by U.S. President R. Reagan" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Washington, 22 Jun (TASS) -- U.S. President Ronald Reagan made a speech in Glassboro, New Jersey, dealing with the U.S. position on arms control issues. The President declared that "for us there can be no more important task than the reduction of nuclear weapons." In the speech there are quite a few grand words to the effect that there already exists a favorable atmosphere for a new summit meeting, that the time has come to move forward in the arms reduction issue and to strive for mutual understanding instead of suspicion, and that "talks alone are not enough" and it is time "to move on to action for the sake of peace." "If both sides really want progress," the President said, "there can now be a turning-point in the efforts to strengthen security and world peace." All these words might more aptly be addressed to the U.S. Administration itself.

The President's speech is, as usual, crammed with anti-Soviet cliches about a "promise" supposedly given by the CPSU "to subordinate the whole world to communist supremacy," about Soviet expansionism, totalitarianism, and so forth.

R. Reagan told his listeners that the Soviet Union recently "brought forward proposals concerning a wide range of issues, from the safety of nuclear power stations to the reduction of conventional forces in Europe...the most important thing is that the Soviet representatives in Geneva submitted new proposals on nuclear arms reduction."

Commenting on the President's speech, U.S. observers point out that it was aimed at relaxing the atmosphere of anxiety and protests brought about in the United States, in Western Europe and throughout the world by the latest steps taken by the administration directed at whipping up the arms race. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, "the speech is aimed at reducing the apprehensions in Congress and among the West European allies with respect to Reagan's decision to renounce the agreed limitations of SALT II.

"While expressing verbal support for arms reduction, the administration is, at the same time, continuing to undertake steps in exactly the opposite direction -- steps that lead to an increase in international tension and the threat of war. The President has just presented to Congress a secret report about the way in which the USSR and the United States have fulfilled the SALT I and SALT II agreements. The accompanying letter states plainly that the administration intends to carry out a "full program of strategic modernization," namely a program for creating first-strike strategic nuclear weapons, including the MX missile and the latest cruise missile, as well as implementing the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative."

The President once again confirms that in the future the United States will make decisions on the structure of its strategic forces without taking account of the criteria contained in SALT. To provide propaganda cover for this massive program for U.S. rearmament, the White House has once again put into circulation groundless accusations of imaginary USSR violations of SALT II.

At a press conference, a White House representative asserted that it was allegedly a "simple coincidence" that Reagan's Glassboro speech and his sending of the secret report to Congress took place on the same day.

However, this is assessed here as confirmation of the administration's intention to continue to follow the dangerous path aimed at wrecking the existing regime of arms limitation and at achieving military superiority.

#### Change in Stance Noted

LD212243 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 21 Jun 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Igor Surguchev]

[Excerpt] [Surguchev] Good afternoon, comrades. A broad echo abroad has been provoked by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum first and foremost due to its foreign political part. The responses are numerous and, of course, not synonymous. None the less, their leitmotiv can be singled out, which is the recognition of the fact that the Soviet Union and the socialist countries are persistently looking for ways towards improvement of the international situation, taking ever new steps towards attainment of mutually acceptable agreements with the West in the issue of arms restriction.

I would like to remind you, comrades, of the fact that our country proposes to achieve accords on nonabrogation of the agreements on antimissile defense at least for 15 years and to limit work in the field of the Strategic Defense Initiative by the level of laboratory research that has already been started by the United States. Strategic offensive armament is limited on equal levels. The question of medium-range arms that reach the territory of the other country is resolved separately in this case. Along with this it was said that the Soviet Union, of course, would prefer to negotiate about a radical, 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms capable of reaching one another. On the question of medium-range missiles in Europe, our country consents to British and French nuclear missiles retaining their present number in the European zone, while the correlation concerning this kind of arms between the USSR and the United States would be at zero level. We also committed ourselves to not increasing the number of medium-range missiles in Asia.

These proposals are directly addressed to the United States. Therefore it would be interesting to learn about the reaction from across the ocean. What is the reaction, first and foremost, of course, on the part of Washington officialdom? I address this question to our correspondent in the United States, Vladimir Zvyagin, who is already at the microphone. Vladimir Ilyich, do you hear me?

[Zvyagin] Yes, yes, and I think that the U.S. President Reagan's speech in the small town of Glassboro near New York on Thursday is characteristic. In this speech he stated that the latest Soviet proposals are a potentially positive basis for a further actions. It is to be noted that therein the U.S. President for the first time in many months

abstained from sweeping the Soviet proposals aside from the outset. He stated the following: We cannot accept these proposals in the form they have, but they represent a broad basis for joint further actions. It seems to me that it is not simply the position of the present administration that manifested itself, but that it is to a considerable extent also the aspiration of wide political and public circles of the United States for concrete steps, concrete actions which are being reflected herein.

NEW YORK TIMES Cited

LD222053 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 22 Jun 86

[Text] New York June 22 TASS -- The newspaper "NEW YORK TIMES" today published an article which draws attention to the clearly contradictory statements on the question of Soviet-U.S. relations and arms control made by high-ranking U.S. Administration officials, including the President himself.

Recalling that in his speech in Glassboro Ronald Reagan described the USSR's new peace proposals as a "serious effort" and called for the U.S. and the Soviet Union to "leave behind suspicion between our peoples and replace it with understanding", the paper indicates that "this is the president who has often used some very different language about the Russians and their regime". "These are also the Moscow proposals that were repeatedly brushed aside by administration leaders as mere propaganda".

"The administration has said in sequence", the paper goes on to write not without irony, "that SALT-2 is dead, that the U.S. will no longer observe its limitations, that it is not dead but just stopped existing because of Soviet violations, that the U.S. won't build more nuclear weapons than the Russians do, and that Washington's purpose is not to undermine SALT-2 but to go on to dismantling more weapons under a new, more rigorous treaty. It has said that it will abide by the anti-ballistic missile treaty, that the treaty is really elastic anyway and can accommodate star wars development, and that it doesn't like the Soviet request for a commitment not to denounce the ABM Treaty for 15 to 20 years". At the same time the administration "refuses to negotiate on an end to all nuclear tests."

"THE NEW YORK TIMES" emphasises that in light of all these discordant statements observers cannot fail to wonder as to whether Washington "was determined to bewilder and disorient" the Soviet leadership with conflicting policy statements. "The surface evidence doesn't require a great stretch of the imagination, though, to conclude that somebody somewhere is busy making sure that signals (about U.S. intentions -- TASS note) are regularly crossed", "THE NEW YORK TIMES" observes. "It isn't surprising to hear questions about a confusion plot".

"THE NEW YORK TIMES" arrives at the conclusion that there is, certainly, "no visible decision to set forth coherent, consistent, cogent statements of American policy, so that both friends and adversaries can know what to expect from the U.S...various administration spokesmen as well as important members of Congress and people of influence go off in so many directions that the streamers merely flap, without a prevailing wind".

"There isn't much chance in the circumstances that either side will 'leave suspicion behind'. Administration zigzag talk only serves to increase it, including the suspicion that Washington is deliberately scheming to confuse...it is time to explode the confusion-plot theory and enounce clear policy".

/9738  
CSO: 5200/1441



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S PETROVSKIY ADDRESSES CD, ASSAILS U.S. STANCE

Critical of U.S. Stand

LD241546 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy has said at the conference on disarmament in Geneva that, although the United States claims to favor an agreement, it refuses to respect the existing agreements like the SALT II treaty. Petrovskiy said the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms had not moved a single inch, because the administration in Washington had refused to reply positively to the realistic compromise proposals put forward in Geneva by the Soviet Union.

Sees 'Complete' Lack of Progress

AU241548 Paris AFP in English 1542 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, United Nations, June 24 (AFP) -- The U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks in Geneva are "characterised by a complete absence of progress," the Soviet deputy foreign minister, Vladimir Petrovskiy, said Tuesday.

"We put our proposals on the table -- we have received no response," he said at a press conference. The proposals include a 15-year extension in the upholding of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty that was put forward last month by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Mr. Petrovskiy said the talks were stagnating at a time when the arms race, in conventional weapons, was heating up and space was threatened with militarisation. The talks focus on reductions in the numbers of medium- and long-range nuclear missiles and preventing the spread of the arms race to space.

In other comments, Mr. Petrovskiy told the U.N. Conference on Disarmament here Tuesday that a treaty banning nuclear testing was "a top priority." He called for simultaneous solution of the issues of verification and prohibition that have hindered progress on this question. The Soviet Union has unilaterally banned nuclear tests until August, but the United States has said it will continue with its programme. As far as agreement on chemical weapons was concerned, Mr. Petrovskiy said, Washington's recent decision to manufacture binary chemical shells "gives us serious grounds to doubt."

/9738

CSO: 5200/1441

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### SOVIET INTERIM PROPOSAL SEEKS TO BREAK GENEVA 'STANDSTILL'

LD171421 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Commentary by Vladimir Chernysev, TASS military affairs observer]

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jun (TASS) -- The alarming international situation insistently dictates that the existing mechanisms of bilateral and multilateral talks on limitation and reduction of weapons and on disarmament must work effectively, and not be employed as a screen for justifying an arms race. The Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee called upon other countries to unify efforts aimed at ending the arms race on earth and preventing one in space. Named among the urgent tasks was that of achieving specific accords at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva.

How then do matters stand at those talks? Unfortunately, the U.S. side has no desire at all to manifest serious willingness to embark on a practical resolution of the principal problems of eliminating the nuclear threat. Washington has not made a constructive revision of its proposals on strategic weapons presented last November, directed toward gaining unilateral advantages for the United States. It is blocking a resolution on eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe by referring to the stance of Britain and France, and by demanding a weakening in the USSR's defenses on the eastern borders while the U.S. is continuing to create and deploy more and more new nuclear weapons and making intensive preparations for the militarization of space.

In a conversation with the editors of provincial newspapers and television and radio companies the other day, the head of the White House stated directly: "We are now carrying out a program of modernizing our forces...we have no intention of renouncing this program...the moment is approaching when we will have to go beyond the framework envisaged by SALT II in order to continue this modernization." Do such statements and practice by official Washington accord with the declarative statements by U.S. Administration spokesmen on their alleged interest in reducing nuclear arsenals? Obviously not.

It is not without reason that the U.S. mass information media class all this as "a plan to win the arms race" and come to the conclusion that there is a continuing lack of confidence regarding the United States in matters relating to arms control. This is due to the fact that the administration does not demonstrate a serious approach to these problems. Senator J. Biden gave a frank description of the situation that has come about: "In the U.S. Administration, control over arms policy is in the hands of those who have for many years tried to mess up the entire structure of arms limitation." Such a policy leads to the world, in the graphic expression of THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, finding itself at a sinister crossroads of uncertainty.

It is quite clear that in such circumstances, the Soviet Union was faced with the question of whether to continue to stay at a standstill in the Geneva negotiations -- squabbling with the United States, which suits the Americans very well -- or to seek new approaches that will allow the way to be cleared toward cutting nuclear armaments? Without doubt, this is an important and serious question. The USSR has already gone too great a part of the way in its striving to create conditions for drawing up constructive accords, while the United States has simply not budged from its ossified position. There is, however, an awareness in the USSR of very high responsibility toward the peoples and mankind for the destiny of peace in our nuclear and space era. It is for this reason that, guided by the aspiration to bring about a radical turnaround for the better in the present difficult situation, the decision was taken to continue firmly to adhere to the policy of practical search for a mutually-acceptable agreement in Geneva.

On 11 June the USSR delegation at Geneva introduced an interim variant of a solution to problems connected with the non-militarization of space and with reducing strategic weapons. It was proposed to reach an accord between the USSR and the United States on staying within the ABM treaty for at least 15 years, and to restrict work in the field of SDI to the level of laboratory research, that is, the threshold which the United States has in practice already reached.

In the field of strategic offensive weapons, the USSR of course would prefer to agree immediately on a radical, 50 percent reduction in all such weapons of the Soviet Union and of the United States capable of reaching each other's territory. But it is ready now, as an interim measure, to go as far as limiting, to equal levels, inter-continental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers, that is, those components of strategic offensive forces which in the United States it is customary to call the "strategic triad." The question of intermediate-range weapons capable of reaching the other side, including land-based cruise missiles, would thereby be tackled separately.

The new proposals of the USSR again demonstrate the Soviet Union's aspiration to guarantee the achievement of a mutually acceptable accord, to bar the way to the nuclear arms race, and as quickly as possible to move on to their mutual reductions -- moreover, deep reductions, as has already been calculated by the WASHINGTON POST. Acceptance of the variant proposed by the Soviet Union would mean reducing strategic nuclear weapons by approximately one-third, as an interim measure on the road to still more significant reductions.

Time will show how these proposals will be perceived by the U.S. leadership. But it should even now be clear in Washington that if it ignores the Soviet initiatives this time too, it will become obvious that the present U.S. administration is playing an unserious game on a most serious issue, on which the future of mankind depends.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1441



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS MILITARY COMMENTATOR DOUBTS U.S. COMMITMENT

LD181318 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 18 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

The disturbing international situation urgently requires that the existing mechanisms of bilateral and multilateral negotiations on limiting and reducing armaments and on disarmament should operate effectively, rather than be used as a cover-up for the arms race.

The Budapest meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee came out with a call on other countries to pool efforts with a view to ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space.

The task of achieving concrete agreements at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva was named among the burning problems.

How are the talks going on? Regrettably, the American side does not wish to display a serious readiness to start tackling the important problems of eliminating the nuclear menace.

Washington has not as yet revised constructively its proposals concerning strategic armaments, tabled in November last year and directed at gaining unilateral advantages for the United States.

It blocks the solution of the question of abolishing nuclear weapons in Europe by references to the position of Britain and France, by the demand for weakening Soviet defences on the eastern borders while keeping the American Armed Forces posted in that region.

In effect, the U.S. is continuing the development and deployment of ever new nuclear weapons and is intensively preparing for the militarization of outer space.

The White House chief, during his conversation with editors of regional newspapers, television and radio companies the other day, remarked, "we are engaged now in modernization programme.... We're not going to retreat from that modernization.... There is coming a moment in which, to continue with that modernization, will take us beyond the terms of SALT."

Do such remarks and practical deeds by the official Washington tally with the declarations of administration officials about their alleged interest in nuclear arms reductions? Certainly not.

U.S. mass media bodies classify all that as a plan to win the arms race, and conclude that the absence of trust in the U.S. on the questions of arms control persists because the administration does not show a serious approach to these problems.

Senator Joseph Biden, in describing frankly the situation, said that within the U.S. Administration, control over arms policy was in the hands of those who for many years sought to disrupt the entire set-up of arms reductions.

The policy of this sort, THE LOS ANGELES TIMES put it, was taking the world to the ominous crossroads of uncertainty.

It is perfectly clear that under these circumstances, the Soviet Union has been confronted with the question of whether to continue marking the time at the Geneva talks and squabbling with the Americans, which quite suits them, or look for new approaches making it possible to clear the way for nuclear arms reductions.

The question is, undoubtedly, important and serious. The USSR has covered too long a part of the road in its desire to create conditions for working out constructive agreements, while the U.S. has failed to move an inch. The Soviet Union realizes its lofty responsibility to the peoples and nations for the destinies of peace in the nuclear and space age.

That is why, guided by the desire to achieve a radical turn for the better in the present-day complicated situation, the decision was adopted to stick firmly to the line towards the practical search for a mutually acceptable agreement in Geneva.

On June 11, the Soviet delegation tabled in Geneva an interim option for resolving the problems of non-militarization of outer space and reduction of strategic armaments.

It was proposed to conclude a Soviet-American agreement on remaining within the anti-ballistic missile treaty for at least 15 years, while limiting SDE work to laboratories, that is the level practically attained by the U.S.

In the field of strategic offensive armaments, the USSR would surely prefer to agree on a radical, 50-per cent reduction of all such weapons of the USSR and the United States, which reach the territories of each other.

Already now, it is prepared to agree, as an interim step, on the restriction down to equal levels of the inter-continental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers, that is the components of the strategic offensive forces called the strategic triad in the U.S.

The question of medium-range armaments, reaching the other side, including ground-based cruise missiles, would be handled separately.

The USSR's latest proposals demonstrate yet another time its desire to ensure the conclusion of a mutually acceptable agreement, put an obstacle in the way of the nuclear arms race and start mutual cuts, deep cuts at that, as soon as possible.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper, accepting the Soviet proposal would mean the reduction of the strategic nuclear armaments by about one-third as an interim measure towards deeper cuts. Time will show what the U.S. leadership's response to the proposals will be. But it ought to be clear to Washington even now that if it, this time as well, ignores the Soviet initiatives, this will become apparent that the present American Administration is not being serious in the most serious question which determines the future of mankind.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET GENERAL VOLKOGONOV DISCUSSES STRATEGIC MILITARY PARITY

LD171910 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in German 1930 GMT 16 Jun 86

[Commentary by Colonel General Dmitriy Volkogonov, military analyst; in Russian fading into German translation]

[Text] In the world arena two concepts currently confront one another. The U.S. and its NATO allies adhere in practice to the course of ensuring their own security at the expense of ensuring the same for their political opposites. For the realization of these concepts, the U.S. Administration has quite openly set out to achieve unilateral military advantage over the Soviet Union. The Soviet concept, on the other hand, starts from the truly just principle of equal security for all. It is only by actually observing this principle in practice that one can finally pursue the path of a gradual, progressive reduction of nuclear arms up to their full elimination by the year 2000.

It is well-known that this strategic anti-war plan, this plan for a nuclear weapon-free world, was submitted by Mikhail Gorbachev in January of this year. Also, the participants in the recent deliberations of the PCC of the Warsaw Pact members in Budapest stated that they supported the plan submitted by the Soviet Union for the full liquidation of nuclear weapons and other types of mass destruction weapons everywhere by the end of this century. The topicality and the far-reaching nature of this Soviet plan are attracting the broadest attention of progressive world public opinion. But the West, and above all Washington, has so far made no positive reply to the Soviet initiative.

As can be seen from the numerous statements by Caspar Weinberger and other hawks, the U.S. does not intend to relinquish its policy of achieving a decisive, great superiority. This is why the fate of the preservation of peace is, today more than ever before, most closely linked with the possibilities that the Soviet Union and its allies possess for the protection of peace. It has become apparent today that no agreement has been reached on mutual, balanced and step-by-step destruction of nuclear weapons and, in view of the militaristic challenge, guarantees for security exist only because of the capability of socialism to maintain strategic military parity. The establishment of this is assessed in the new CPSU Program as an historic achievement of socialism. The approximate balance in strategic forces consolidates the position of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and completely upsets the calculations of the aggressive imperialist circles for victory in nuclear war. The CPSU Program stresses that the preservation of this balance constitutes the guarantee for maintaining peace and international security.

The protection of socialism takes as its point of departure the important political condition of maintaining the Soviet Armed Forces at a level that excludes strategic superiority on the part of imperialism. Not doing so would be tantamount to encouraging the potential aggressor who, as the facts prove, has not renounced attempts to achieve unilateral military advantages and to decide the main contradictions of the epoch in his favor through military means.

It is no secret that in recent years alone the Pentagon has elaborated quite a few scenarios for achieving a decisive military victory. For the planners in the NATO bunkers, for example, the most advantageous for them would be the model of a possible war that is limited to the territory of Western Europe and the Soviet Union while keeping the United States outside. In the opinion of the U.S. military office, however, this could only be achieved if the U.S. nuclear missile forces in Europe are such that they would divert a considerable part of the potential of the Soviet Union's [word indistinct] to themselves. But even this is too little for them today. Today in the Pentagon, as is well-known, particular hopes are attached to the so-called SDI, the purpose of which is to establish a space-based strike system that would offer the possibility of making a first strike against the adversary and also prevent a retaliatory strike, or at least to rapidly weaken such a strike.

Those who are in the highest organs of power across the ocean and those who hold the tiller of the arms industry complex are, in forcing the star wars plans through to the point of practical realization, putting the future of the whole world at risk. The fact of the matter is that the U.S. military space program, should it be implemented, would torpedo the negotiations on arms control and cancel the already existing agreements. Moreover, the U.S. Administration has already embarked on a path of throwing overboard the existing accords by actually abrogating SALT II. As a result, the situation of strategic chaos and military instability is most grave. If the basis of strategic balance is shaken or cracked, no one will be able to guarantee that instead of, as the U.S. President said, SDI helping to make nuclear weapons obsolete, the space strategists might nonetheless use them.

The war hawks do not seem to realize that the Soviet Union will in no way allow the United States to gain unilateral advantage, whether on earth or in space, and the pursuit of this unattainable dream of military superiority is a fruitless and dangerous policy. If the leaders of the United States and NATO would grasp this unalterable truth then our country's historic, constructive proposals for bilateral, step-by-step reduction in the level of strategic balance until the elimination of nuclear weapons could become the basis for a cardinal change for the better in our world. As long as this does not happen, however, socialism's capability to maintain the balance of strength at a very high level is endangered by fault of the Americans. This parity offers the chief material guarantee of security that serves the preservation of peace.

Here one must take into account the fact that the Soviet strategic forces are intended only for a retaliatory strike because of our peace-loving policy and the government commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. On the other hand, U.S. weapons are intended for dealing a first strike. The strategic balance makes ephemeral the hopes of the militaristic circles of the United States and the Pentagon military clique for the possibility of victory in a nuclear war.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1444



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET GENERAL CHERVON COMMENTS ON SDI, SALT II, SS-20'S

PM191436 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 17 Jun 86 p 12

[Interview with Soviet Army General Nikolay Chervov by Andrea Tarquini in Budapest, date not given]

[Text] Budapest -- "It was the winter of 1941 and the wind and snow lashed at our cheeks and overcoats. I was a few years younger than you, a young lieutenant fresh out of the academy, and it was in that infantry unit that I held my first command -- outside the gates of Moscow, against the Wehrmacht." General Nikolay Chervov relaxed for a moment to recall epic and grim episodes of the past.

He went on, with his combination of old-fashioned pride and nostalgia: "What I mean is that our strategy does not give in so easily in the face of unexpected challenges. If this were to happen it would mean chaos for us." When meeting with journalists, Chervov dons his empire-style khaki uniform and black boots -- a face reminiscent of Anthony Quinn's atop a beribboned dress jacket.

[Tarquini] So, General, how are you coping with the American challenge?

[Chervov] We will respond to rearmament tit for tat, nuclear warhead for nuclear warhead, missile for missile, if they start again. We will never be the first to rearm. Ours remains a defensive strategy aimed solely at national security. We will defend parity at all costs.

[Tarquini] But, General, was it not your excessively large arsenal that prompted an insecure America to protect itself?

[Chervov] No, Reagan told us one thing, then did another. They averred they did not want more strategic missiles than us, while at the same time striving to gain an advantage in other areas -- from cruise missiles to the SDI project. Now not even those weapons are enough for them: They want a return to superiority in strategic missiles. I repeat: We will not permit them to do so. If they violate the treaty, all its restrictions will cease to be valid for us too.

[Tarquini] With what weapons can you respond?

[Chervov] With more heavy missiles, more warheads, and more bombers. Also with missile-launching submarines or other weapons.

We will simply keep up with them, as we have always succeeded in doing since the beginning of the cold war.



Remember, they have never succeeded in gaining a lasting advantage, and they will not succeed this time either. Not even with SDI. The Americans overestimate their technological advantages. Sooner or later we will catch up.

[Tarquini] So will you leave Geneva slamming the door behind you, as you did over the Euromissiles?

[Chervov] No, I am not saying that. The situation in Geneva is difficult and Reagan must bear the responsibility for it. Both before and after the announcement that America is to tear up SALT II we submitted proposals, and they have failed to reply. We want to continue negotiating.

[Tarquini] What have you proposed?

[Chervov] We have submitted a draft agreement on Euromissiles: They insist that we eliminate all our SS 20's, even those deployed in Asia; we respond by offering to eliminate all the SS 20's and SS 4's and also 18 ship-borne missiles from the Baltic in exchange for all the cruise and Pershing missiles. They have not yet replied.

[Tarquini] What do you intend to offer the Europeans? You propose separate negotiations to Paris and London, but you cannot offer the same SS 20's in Geneva, then to the French and British as well...

[Chervov] Yes we can: We are offering them too a reduction in our SS 20's proportionate to their own forces. It depends on how things go in Geneva: If necessary we will also offer to reduce other kinds of weapons. We shall see, once we have started negotiating. We do not have preconceived stances.

[Tarquini] But, General, does the prospect of a nuclear peace without arms limitation not weigh negatively on our strategy?

[Chervov] I repeat: No. What concerns us more are the changes of strategy in Washington: It seems to us that the new American chiefs of staff have fewer reservations about rearmament plans than their predecessors. I believe that the military-industrial complex has a more attentive audience in them.

[Tarquini] Ah, yes, the military-industrial complex. Do you Soviet military leaders realize what a burden you place on your own economy?

[Chervov] We realize it more than you think. It is in the interests of the country's security and stability to have a lull in the arms race that will permit us to construct new and better cities and to give the people more consumer goods. But believe me: Our people are fully aware of security requirements and will understand us.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS CITES FRG SPD LEADER ON SDI, SALT II

LD221557 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 22 Jun 86

[Text] West Berlin, June 22 TASS — "If the Social-Democratic Party comes to power in Bonn, it will cancel without delay the agreement with the United States on the involvement of the Federal Republic of Germany in the 'star wars' programme", said Hans Jochen Vogel, chairman of the group of the Social-Democratic party of Germany (SPD) in the Bundestag.

Speaking at the congress of the Social Democratic Party of West Berlin here, he warned Washington against jettisoning adherence to the SALT II treaty and demanded that the Soviet Union's proposals on disarmament be made the subject of serious talks. The United States' refusal to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing is an error of great magnitude, Vogel stressed.

Criticizing the policy of the Bonn Cabinet, he noted that when the current coalition took office it promised to ensure peace by diminishing weapons stockpiles. In reality, however, the arms race continually builds up steam during the rule of the CDU/CSU-FDP coalition.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW 'TOP PRIORITY' PANEL ON SALT II, ABM TREATY, SDI, INF

LD231525 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 22 Jun 86

["Top Priority" program, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov, with Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov "of the Moscow-based Institute for United States of America and Canada Studies"]

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] First, an observation concerning June. It's a month when mass vacations begin; at the same time it's one of the most politically action-packed months in U.S.-Soviet relations. Well, I think it's due to political timetables rather than sunspots. Here are a few examples. Take June 1973. Our two countries signed an accord concerning the peaceful use of atomic energy and also an agreement to govern Soviet-American negotiations. Or take June of 1979, when the SALT II treaty was signed in Vienna, Austria. There is bitter irony in the fact that 7 years later, in June 1986, the SALT II treaty was pronounced dead by the Reagan administration. So my first question, or rather suggestion, to you, Professor Bogdanov, is that we take stock of the current situation in Soviet-American relations.

[Bogdanov] Well, unfortunately, I have no rosy picture to present to you and to present to our listeners over there. I am afraid that the Soviet-American relations are rolling now to its lowest level. And, you know, I cannot help but to say that June is a month of funerals, you know, very sad funerals and very important funerals. If something is dead you always think who is dead, what is dead, and to my mind not just the SALT II treaty is dead, the whole conception of Soviet-American arms control, the whole conception, the whole (?structure) of Soviet-American relations is dead by the denial of SALT II treaty.

[Kuznetsov] We still have the ABM Treaty.

[Bogdanov] We still have an ABM Treaty, but my suspicion is that the next target for those people taking the upper hand in the White House is just the ABM Treaty, and I am dead sure that that is their strategic design, you know, to kill the last remnants of the Soviet-American structure one by one. Now they killed SALT II, the next target is ABM Treaty. Let me say something of the sort, you may not agree with me, but that's my feeling really that we have witnessed a kind of coup d'etat in the White House. What I mean by that, we were used for so many years of the Reagan administration that we have witnessed some pragmatic people in the administration. Some people in the State Department, they were trying to put on the right rail -- track -- Soviet-American relations, they were trying to do something at least to improve it. Now my impression that the State Department has been taken over finally by those people who wouldn't like to have nothing with [as heard] the Soviet Union. That's my very grim,

you know, assessment. Maybe I am wrong, but being a student of this administration for the last 6 years I come to that conclusion. And the SALT treaty failure, you know, how it was done, in what way, just proves to me that a kind of a coup d'etat had happened in the White House.

[Kuznetsov] But according to the latest story by Bernard Gwertzman in THE NEW YORK TIMES, he says that the State Department people still resist and they still disagree on certain things with the administration, with the Pentagon, and still believe that there is room for genuine progress. That's what he said.

[Bogdanov] You know, I wish I could agree with Bernie Gwertzman. I respect him very much as a very high-class journalist and very knowledgeable, very informed one. Maybe he has in mind, you know, the frontline, with very few people left which are not yet killed by high artillery [laughs], and that's what he means. If it is so I agree with him, but I mean that the institution, that the, you know, positive factor in the Soviet-American relations to my mind the State Department ruined.

[Kuznetsov] To back you up on what you said when you painted a rather grim picture of Soviet-American relations, I have two reports. One says that the United States Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has rejected certain key elements of the new Soviet arms control offer concerning the Strategic Defense Initiative. Mr Weinberger, according to this report, said that he is against any moves that would prevent the United States from refusing to abide by the ABM Treaty. And another report by the UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL says that President Reagan has assured Afghan counter-revolutionaries, when they met with the President in the White House, that he would not sign an arms control agreement with Moscow at the expense of their movement. My question to you, Professor Plekhanov, could you respond to these two reports?

[Plekhanov] You know, I think that's a clear reflection of the priorities of foreign policy of the current administration in Washington, because if they consider that building up arms is more important than constraining the arms race, or that it is more important to support terrorist movements trying to overthrow legitimate governments in various parts of the world than to conclude agreements with the Soviet Union, then everything becomes logical. I mean, it's easy to see why we have problems in Soviet-American relations, just a wrong set of priorities. Instead of trying to cool down the passions and to lower the risk of confrontation between East and West, between the Soviet Union and the United States, they are fanning up the flames. They are doing some very dangerous things and I am afraid that these two episodes that you refer to are the two key elements of what is called the Reagan doctrine.

[Kuznetsov] My feeling about the President's pledge to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries not to sign any agreement with Moscow at the expense of their movement is that this report, in my view -- if I'm mistaken, please correct me -- amounts to an admission that Soviet-American relations have been shoved into a very far corner of American politics, shoved far beyond the level of any significance.

[Bogdanov] Yeah, I tend to agree with you and I think you are quite right. A fact is a fact. The Soviet-American relations now are, as I put it already, at such a low level that, you know, the President of the great country can afford to discuss even diplomatic recognition, you know, for the rebels, and though his recognition was not accorded but they had discussed it, that's what's the matter. You know, they have seriously discussed it and the President hinted that in case they will get all the, you know, state attributes and the other -- some other -- people will join in recognizing

them, then United States will follow. You know, the fact itself that the United States reached such a point when they can just to [as heard] link arms control with Afghan bandits on one side and the Soviet-American relations on the (?far) -- on the other -- side, that's what really proves once again my maybe extreme view about the coup d'etat which had happened in the White House.

[Kuznetsov] Well, in my last edition of "Top Priority" you, Professor Bogdanov, promised to take a look at the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee and especially at its decisions concerning conventional weapons and forces in Europe.

[Kuznetsov] Another point I'd like to make is that when Mikhail Gorbachev advanced his proposal on 15th January to get rid of all nuclear weapons and ban space-strike weapons by the end of this century, some people said that judging by the order of priorities, judging by the way the statement was arranged, the Soviets and their allies don't give too much importance to conventional weapons because they were mentioned as the last thing during the third stage.

[Bogdanov] I am afraid that there is a very convincing logic in our January statement. Why it was focussed on nuclear arms first of all. He focussed on the main danger, the most dangerous part of our Armament. And if you are, you know, clever enough reader you could have noticed not only between lines but some very important paragraphs in this statement connected with conventional arms. By the way, in that statement it was already mentioned that the danger is that some weapons systems, conventional weapons systems, are of the same might now that they may be compared to the tactical nuclear weapons. We have already laid ground for that work. So first we focussed attention on our disarmament plan (?in liquidation) of nuclear arms, then, after some months, Mikhail Gorbachev in Berlin gave some more concrete proposals on conventional arms, then, at the Political Council of Warsaw Treaty in Budapest we have suggested the comprehensive, you know, plan how to deal with conventional arms. If you link all these three things I believe that our listeners may come to the conclusion there is a logic in that.

[Kuznetsov] At the full-scale meeting of the Communist Party's Central Committee our leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, has unveiled a set of new Soviet offers in the area of arms control. What are they? This question to you, Professor Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] What the Soviet Union is offering now, and that offer has been made at the negotiating table already, in Geneva, is that both sides commit themselves not to break out of the ARM Treaty of 1972 for at least 15 years. It is an important holding action because the SDI, the American SDI, is now already very gravely undermining the ABM Treaty, and what we are offering now is that we keep the treaty for at least 15 years and limit the work in the sphere of SDI to just research.

[Kuznetsov] Laboratory research.

[Plekhanov] Laboratory research who... and that's actually the threshold at which the U.S. program is now finding itself. So that would be, of course, a less far-reaching step than simply banning. We have been insisting on a complete ban on all space-strike weapons, but since the United States has now...

[Kuznetsov interrupting] Already adopted.



[Plekhanov resumes] Yeah, it's already reached its level and since it's been very, you know, recalcitrant in its position, what we are now doing is offering a step which could accommodate both sides and could still put a cap on this very dangerous trend. The other one involves cuts in the numbers of strategic offensive weapons. As far as the medium-range offensive missiles are concerned -- offensive forces are concerned -- it could be decided separately and we could have a separate agreement on that. So that's a modification of our position which should provide an opening and a breakthrough, if you will, at the talks in Geneva, so that we could conclude an agreement to the (?effect).

[Kuznetsov] Looking at the numerous Soviet initiatives, one can notice that they are in constant flux, in a constant movement. Some of them are amended, others are dropped, new ones appear. For example, like you said, the issue of medium-range weapons capable of reaching the territory of the other side, including long-range land-based cruise missiles, has been proposed to be dealt with separately from strategic weapons, and we all remember that some time ago we considered Pershing-21 missiles and Tomahawks deployed in Europe as a hefty addition to the American strategic arsenal because of their proximity to our borders, short flight time. You know, Pershings can strike our targets here in this country in 6 to 8 minutes, they have devastating accuracy and a very sufficient (?shields). Could you explain all these modifications in the Soviet position? Some interpret them as a sign of weakness.

[Bogdanov] I would put it like that. First of all it's a sign of creative capabilities of our side. Number two, we are really always in flux. Why? Because we are keeping our fingers on the American position, just trying to study, to understand it, and wherever it is possible just to accommodate. I put this word deliberately, to accommodate Americans, to help them, to help them to come to an agreement with us. Once it leads to real arms control, to arms agreements, it is OK with me.

[Kuznetsov] But at the same time, Professor Plekhanov, our leader has said, and has repeatedly warned, that we would not allow American superiority.

[Plekhanov] We can have a deal with the United States on the basis of equal security and the modification of our position has to do not with offering an edge to the Americans, or granting them an edge, but it has to do with simply moving toward the goal of nuclear disarmament step by step, putting certain things up front on which agreement can be reached in the near future and putting off more difficult elements until a more opportune time.

[Bogdanov] (?Well), I am sorry Sergey, what we are doing now, we always open windows of opportunities for the Americans, that is for them now to take it or not.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, our time is up. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on "Top Priority", a weekly panel discussion of major world events. Welcome to "Top Priority" a week from now at the same time and on the same wavelength.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1441



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

XINHUA CALLS SOVIET PROPOSAL NOTEWORTHY 'INTERIM AGREEMENT'

OW261017 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 1456 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 24 Jun (XINHUA) -- News Analysis: A Noteworthy "Interim Agreement"

[By] XINHUA reporter Tang Xiushan

Because the Soviet-U.S. disarmament talks in Geneva had been at a standstill for a long time, the Soviet Union recently proposed an "interim agreement," which Soviet leader Gorbachev described as a new step taken by the Soviet Union to reach a mutually acceptable agreement at the Geneva talks. Initially the proposal differs from previous Soviet proposals in the following three noteworthy points:

First, the Soviet Union has changed its previous staunch position of diametrically opposing the United States' "Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]", and began to recognize its existence and agree to a star wars program limited to laboratory research, that is, to a program limited to the level the United States has already reached. At the same time, the Soviet Union has proposed that both sides agree not to withdraw from the treaty limiting antiballistic guided missile defense systems for a period of at least 15 years. In view of the treaty's stipulation that both sides not set up nationwide antiballistic guided missile defense systems, the proposal actually demands that the United States not deploy space strike weapons for the next 15 years.

Second, prior to this proposal, the Soviet Union had proposed that both sides reduce their offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent during a period of between 5 to 8 years. Now, the Soviet Union has lowered its demand by proposing that both sides limit their offensive strategic weapons to equal ceilings. The so-called "equal ceilings" means having a flexible quota, and demands only "equal" limitation. It is said that the Soviet side has already proposed a 30-percent reduction, thus cutting the scale and slowing down the pace of the reduction.

Third, in the past, the Soviet Union emphasized that the reduction of offensive strategic weapons has "possibly only under the condition that both the Soviet and U.S. sides refuse to manufacture, test, and deploy space strike weapons." However, as far as the reduction of offensive strategic weapons is concerned, the "interim agreement" does not include the precondition of tying the reduction to space arms, and actually agrees that these two issues can be solved separately.

Judging from the "interim agreement," although the Soviet Union has somewhat changed its position and lowered its demands, the proposal for "equal ceilings" does not mean allowing the United States to gain extra advantage. In a nutshell, the Soviet Union absolutely does not allow the United States to gain military supremacy, and the Soviet stand of preventing the United States from getting a head start in deploying space weapons remains basically unchanged.

After the Soviet Union made the latest proposal at the Geneva talks, Reagan, who had consistently refused downright any Soviet proposal for disarmament, made a certain positive appraisal of the latest Soviet proposal in a recent speech at Glassboro. He said: This is a beginning of serious efforts by the Soviet side to reduce nuclear weapons, and may become a turning point in the Soviet-U.S. nuclear arms talks. What he appreciated was primarily the point that the Soviet Union no longer demanded that he gave up "SDI" and did not insist that abandoning space arms be a precondition for the reduction of strategic weapons. However, Reagan added, without amendments, the latest Soviet proposal would be unacceptable to the United States.

It seems that the United States has somewhat shifted its position. However, it is not an easy task to reach an accord because the disarmament talks, which are extremely complicated issues, involve the vital interests of both sides.

/9738

CSO: 5200/4048

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRC: U.S.-SOVIET ARMS TALKS END WITHOUT PROGRESS

OW261727 Beijing XINHUA in English 1555 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, June 26 (XINHUA) -- The 5th round of the U.S.-Soviet negotiations on nuclear and space weapons ended here today after the two superpowers failed to reach any agreement. Before the U.S. and Soviet delegations met in the American mission here this morning, Soviet chief delegate Victor Karpov said that he has not perceived "any progress" in the current round of talks which started May 8.

During the past seven weeks, the Soviet delegation put forward several proposals on strategic, intermediate and space weapons reduction which have been rejected by the American side as "old offers in new wraps". However, when the Soviet Union proposed a package of arms reduction proposals in Jun 11 which would allow the research of outer space weapons in laboratories, U.S. President Ronald Reagan said it could be a "turning point" in the U.S.-Soviet relations. Nevertheless, Reagan insisted that the United States could not accept the proposals "without changes".

Informed sources said that a new round of arms talks may begin here on September 18.

The U.S. chief delegate, Max Kampelman, told reporters today that despite the "true, important and substantial differences" between the United States and the Soviet Union, there still exist "possibilities for serious and constructive discussions." He expressed the hope that the next round of talks will open ways for serious dialogues and lead to an agreement in certain aspects of arms control.

/9738

CSO: 5200/4050

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

BEIJING REVIEW: ARMS RACE SEEN STILL ON GRUELING COURSE

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English No 25, 23 Jun 86 p 10

[Commentary by Peng Di]

[Text]

**D**espite worldwide pleas to curb the escalating arms race between the two superpowers, neither side is ready to relinquish superiority in the name of sensibility.

The US government recently proposed a military budget of US\$311.6 billion for fiscal year 1987, an increase of 8.2 percent over 1986. Its programme for the development of new strategic weapons includes turning out and deploying more MX missiles; stepping up research and production of miniature intercontinental missiles; building the 14th Trident submarine and advanced submarine-based missiles and conducting further research on "invisible" bombers capable of shunning radar pursuit.

Since Washington thinks the Soviet Union exceeds the United States in chemical weapons by a ratio of 10:1, it has resolved to resume its production, which was halted 17 years ago. Conventional weapons also will be renovated. And US President Ronald Reagan's pet project the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) will absorb US\$4.8 billion of the defence budget in 1987, compared with this year's US\$2.7 billion.

Moscow does not intend to lag behind in its arms stockade. With highly destructive SS-25s -- the fifth-generation of USSR-made intercontinental missiles in the process of deployment -- and the highly accurate SS-18s the fourth generation of intercontinental missiles near the end of deployment, the Soviet Union is working on SS-X-24 mobile intercontinental missiles while directing more efforts towards the production of SS-20 medium-range missiles and a new type of SU-27 aircraft. Moreover, thousands of Soviet scientists and engineers are occupied with the research of laser technology capable of missile interception.

The Kremlin has been more active on the issue of disarmament. It is quite outspoken in its call for arms control with a series of highly publicized arms reduction plans. The Soviets introduced in January a long-term programme for the elimination of nuclear arms in stages. Twice, in April and June, they put out proposals for the reduction of conventional weapons and forces in Europe. And they made repeated calls for a mutual end to nuclear testing.

Unable to compete with Moscow in this respect, the White House has been more reticent. It has, nonetheless, called for separating the issue of strategic weapons from medium-ranged ones, while urging for a link in the reduction of weapons in Europe and Asia, maintaining that the Soviet Union has the upper hand in Asia. It also feels that there is a real danger that the United States will be behind its rival in both offensive and strategic defensive weapons. Therefore, ignoring the Soviet calls for a halt to nuclear testing, the United States goes on.

Debate over regional issues between the two superpowers has grown intense.

In the name of anti-terrorism the United States launched a military attack upon Libya and posed threats against Syria as a warning signal to the Middle East.

Equally active in the region, the Soviet Union has provided weapons to some Arab countries, while increasing contact with the Gulf nations and promoting a reconciliation between different factions within the Palestine Liberation Organization. It also has called for an international conference on the Middle East in order to further its influence in the region and contend with the United States.

In Central America, apart from offering military aid to the contras in Nicaragua, the White House has also employed diplomatic means to pressure the ruling government to change course so as to restrict or diminish Soviet influence in the country.

Moscow has been concentrating on its economic problems at home while talking profusely about disarmament internationally. In regional rivalry, it continues to hold fast to its spheres of influence. Far from giving in, it is ready to expand wherever there is an opportunity.

Afghanistan is a case in point. Dissatisfied with mere military assaults on the resistance forces, the Soviets have replaced Karmal with Mohammad Najibullah as leader of the People's Democratic Party. They have also stepped up their pressure against Pakistan. As the United States has repeatedly claimed, the Soviet expedition in Afghanistan has been motivated by the rich Gulf oil fields to which Afghanistan is the pathway.

In Southeast Asia, while offering continuous support to Viet Nam's attempt to control Kampuchea, Moscow has turned down the 8-point peace proposal by the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea. This has made it more obvious that the Soviet interest lies in expansionism in the South Pacific area.

/9317

CSO: 5200/4047



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET CHIEF OF STAFF ON JAPANESE SDI ROLE, SS-20'S

OW111453 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1216 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Interview with Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, by NHK correspondent Iida in Moscow on 11 June -- recorded; interview conducted in Russian with Japanese subtitles; following is from Russian]

[Text] [Iida] If Japan takes part in the scientific research for SDI, what policies will the USSR adopt in relation to Japan?

[Akhromeyev] Perhaps the question of USSR policies toward Japan should be asked of someone else. I am not a political leader but a military person. I can, however, say one thing: in our opinion, Japan is acting incorrectly, for in practice it supports President Reagan's SDI; it appears Japan has not yet realized all the dangers of introducing attack weapons in space.

[Iida] What are the defence policies of the USSR in the Far East and Asian region?

[Akhromeyev] The policies of the Soviet Union, the defensive policies of the Soviet Union, in this region are essentially the same as they are in the rest of the world. The Soviet Union, in matter of its defense is doing nothing, nor does it wish to do anything, above that which is necessary to defend its fatherland and its state so that in all regions -- including the Far East, Asia, and Southeast Asia -- a military balance is maintained and peace is guaranteed.

[Iida] How can the expansion of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Far East be explained; for example, the deployment of SS-20's in the Far East and so forth.

[Akhromeyev] I do not think the Soviet forces are expanding in the Far East. In addition, the deployment of SS-20 rockets, as you said, in the Far East has not been done for a long time. But indeed, definite military forces of the Soviet Union, including a certain quantity of the SS-20 rockets, do exist in the East. But what is the Soviet Union to do if numerous military forces of the United States are being deployed in this region?

[Iida] Is Japan threatening the Soviet Union today?

[Akhromeyev] I think that Japan by itself is not threatening the Soviet Union today. But, as a matter of fact, Japan is tied by the relevant military treat with the United States. As a matter of fact, U.S. military forces are on Japanese territory. American aircraft are constantly in Japanese airspace, and in seas surrounding Japan, numerous American ships are to be found. I think the U.S. policies toward the Soviet Union are known to you. From these spring dangers to the Soviet Union from Japanese territory.

[Iida] Allow me to ask you one last question: What is your predecessor, Mr Ogarkov, engaged in? If possible, please explain concretely.

[Akhromeyev] Well, it is possible, though it is not our custom to give too much emphasis to who our military leaders are and where they are working. Marshal of the Soviet Union Ogarkov is working in the Ministry of Defense and is one of our leading workers. He is performing responsible work and is continuing together with us to labor in order to support the defense capabilities of the Soviet Union on the level that is needed to ensure the security of our country.

[Iida] Thank you very much. It was very interesting.

[Akhromeyev] Thank you.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1441

SALT/START ISSUES

PRC JOURNAL VIEWS U.S.-SOVIET DISPUTE OVER SALT II

HK250918 Beijing LIAOWANG in Chinese No 24, 16 Jun 86 p 5

[Special dispatch from Washington by LIAOWANG contributing reporter Shi Lujia: "Reagan's Decision Has Caused a Great Disturbance"]

[Text] U.S. President Ronald Reagan announced on 27 May that since the Soviet Union had frequently violated the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II), the United States would not be bound by the treaty later this year. The Soviet Union reacted strongly to this decision. Some West European NATO allies expressed opposition or had reservations. Consequently, a rigorous trial lay ahead for U.S.-Soviet relations and U.S.-European relations.

SALT II was signed by the late Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev and former U.S. President Jimmy Carter in Vienna in 1979 after 8 years of negotiations. After the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, the U.S. Senate refused to ratify the treaty. Although the treaty was "fundamentally flawed" and not ratified, the position of the Reagan administration was that the United States would comply with it so long as the Soviet Union does so. The United States reiterated this position at the expiration of the treaty at the end of last year.

When making the new announcement, Reagan decided to replace two old nuclear submarines with a new Trident with nuclear warhead missile launchers so as to keep the United States within the limits of SALT II. He said that the policy would not be effected for the time being, and whether the United States would adhere to the treaty depended on Soviet behavior in the following months. He urged the Soviet Union to stop violations of the treaty, reduce the pace of its arms expansion, and show sincerity at the Geneva nuclear disarmament talks. If the Soviet Union takes these "constructive steps," Reagan said that he would reconsider the decision already made. Even though the treaty is abrogated, he said, provided the Soviet Union is willing to exercise "mutual restraint," the number of strategic nuclear weapons deployed by the United States in the future will not exceed that of the Soviet Union.

The reaction from the Soviet Union was stern. In a 28 May commentary, the Soviet news agency TASS denied any violation and said that Reagan's assertions were groundless. The commentary also charged the United States with harboring a scheme to ensure a unilateral military advantage and said that the Soviet Union would take necessary countermeasures to engage in arms expansion. A few days later, Moscow warned in a sharply worded statement that the Soviet Union would no longer be bound by the two SALT treaties and would take "necessary measures to prevent the strategic equilibrium from being damaged" once Reagan

put his 27 May decision into effect. Soviet leaders also asked West European countries to persuade Reagan to reconsider his decision. During these days, Soviet officials emphasized time and again that the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit would be jeopardized and there would be an "adverse influence" on the Geneva nuclear disarmament talks so long as Washington maintained its hard stand against SALT II.

Following the U.S.-Soviet Geneva summit in November last year, the relations between the two countries seemed relaxed. In the first half of this year, however, both sides engaged in fierce wrangling on a series of issues. Although the Geneva nuclear disarmament talks have reached the fifth round since their resumption in March last year, no substantial progress has been made so far. Both sides have insisted on their respective positions and blamed the other for having no sincerity. Moscow announced on several occasions that it would make sustained efforts to unilaterally halt its nuclear tests and asked Washington to undertake the commitment, and also proposed a summit held as quickly possible on the issue, but Washington refused the offer. The Soviet Union cancelled the meeting of foreign ministers of the two big powers to be held in Washington in May this year, and has not yet decided on a new date because it asserted that the U.S. attack on Libya was "deliberately aimed at intensifying Soviet-U.S. relations." Both the United States and the Soviet Union hope that the second summit can be held within the year, but no agreement has been reached because the positions of both sides are poles apart. Public opinion in the West holds that the new quarrel on SALT II provoked under such circumstances will undoubtedly impair the trend of relaxation and further intensify the relations between the two countries.

Proceeding from their own interests and security, the West European countries require U.S. nuclear protection, but also fear that the vigorous arms expansion of the United States will stimulate the Soviet Union to engage in a new round of the arms race, which could result in a threat to Europe. For this reason, they hope that the United States and the Soviet Union can reach an agreement on maintaining a relatively strategic equilibrium. Although the West European countries are not satisfied with the nuclear arms limitation treaties concluded between the two big powers over the past decade or so, they believe that the treaties concluded are better than nothing at all.

Owing to pressure from U.S. allies and differences within his administration, Reagan did not hastily abrogate SALT II, which he opposed repeatedly during the presidential elections. The fact that Reagan suddenly changed his position has shocked the West European countries. At the conference of NATO foreign ministers held recently in Canada, the foreign ministers of U.S. allies unanimously requested the United States to reconsider the decision. The British Government, which holds identical views with the United States on many international issues, also issued a statement expressing regret over the decision.

The West European countries also expressed dissatisfaction with the United States for not consulting them before making the decision. They pointed out: Despite opposition from the majority of its allies, the United States attacked Libya in April. Now the United States has again ignored their consistent position and has taken this drastic action that involves the relations between East and West as a whole. This shows how far the United States has gone in acting willfully, regardless of its allies. In connection with the recent disputes between the United States and Europe in trade and other issues, some U.S. newspapers fear that Europe will further fall away from the United States in the days to come.

In view of Soviet counterattacks and criticism from Western Europe, U.S. Government officials came out one after another to explain that Reagan's new position is aimed at urging both the Soviet Union and the United States to exercise "mutual restraint," thus reaching a new agreement on sharply reducing nuclear arms. They also reminded people to take note of Reagan's promise that the number of nuclear weapons deployed by the United States in the future will not exceed that of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, it seems that these explanations cannot quell the great disturbance.

/9738

CSO: 5200/4048



## SALT/START ISSUES

XINHUA: U.S. STRATEGIC GOAL SEEKS TO HINDER USSR DEVELOPMENT

OW270028 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 0657 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Commentary by XINHUA reporter Mei Zhenmin: "U.S.-USSR Dispute Over the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty"]

[Text] Beijing, 25 Jun (XINHUA) — U.S. President Reagan declared on 27 May that because the Soviet Union has failed to observe the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty [SALT II], the United States would no longer be bound by this treaty by the end of the year. Then, the Soviet Union warned that it would take "adequate, effective countermeasures," saying that it could not remain "unconcerned" over the U.S. action. The accord, which was signed in June 1979 after 300 talks over a period of 7 years, is now facing the danger of being abrogated.

Reviewing how this treaty was signed, we can see the changes in the relative nuclear strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union and their confrontation.

When Nixon visited the Soviet Union for the first time in July 1959 as vice president of the United States, U.S. nuclear strength was overwhelmingly superior to that of the Soviet Union by 10 to 1. Afterwards, the Soviet Union went all out to expand its military strength, taking advantage of the United States being bogged down in the Vietnam war. When Nixon visited the Soviet Union for the second time as U.S. President and signed the "provisional accord" of SALT I and the Antiballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union in May 1972, the U.S. and Soviet nuclear strengths appeared to be the same. When President Carter and Brezhnev signed SALT II in Vienna in June 1979, the USSR had already exceeded the United States in strategic nuclear weapons launchers. According to official figures released by the two sides at that time, the Soviet Union had 2,504 launchers, and the United States had 2,283. The signing of the two accords indicated that the United States had already lost its nuclear superiority. Under such circumstances, the United States hoped to use the treaty to stop the growing nuclear strength of the Soviet Union which, after becoming equal to the United States in nuclear strength, also wanted to temporarily suspend its competition in quantity so as to concentrate on improving the quality of its nuclear weapons. Since both sides felt that the treaty would limit the other side in terms of quantity, but not quality, the deal was made.

After becoming the head of the White House in 1981, President Reagan decided to "restore national strength" and reverse the unfavorable situation in the arms race with the Soviet Union. In October of the same year after becoming President, he put forward plans to modernize U.S. strategic nuclear strength. Despite the staggering financial deficits, enormous military budgets were earmarked each year for the development and deployment of more advanced nuclear weapons. The current stage is one in which strategic nuclear weapons are being renewed.

According to a report by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military situation in fiscal 1987, "all types of weaponry, from strategic arms to individual arms for ground combat, are being renewed," and "the United States will continue to give top priority to the renewal of its strategic weaponry." In a long article entitled "The U.S. Defense Strategy" published in the spring issue of the FOREIGN AFFAIRS quarterly, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger stressed: "As a result of rebuilding U.S. military strength, the conditions for U.S.-Soviet relations will be redefined."

As the Reagan administration sees it, the United States has now extricated itself from the "Quite unfavorable situation of weakness" during the 1970's and has regained its "status of relatively powerful strength." The Reagan government's declaration that it will abrogate SALT II precisely proceeds from its need to seek military superiority and its intention to "redefine U.S.-USSR relations."

While the United States worked hard to modernize its strategic nuclear strength, the Soviet Union also proceeded to renew its strategic nuclear weapons. Reagan declared his intention to abrogate the treaty mainly because, following the deployment of SS-25 ICBMs, the Soviet Union developed a new generation strategic offensive weapon, the SS-24 mobile ICBM, and violated the treaty in various other areas. However, according to U.S. papers, this was just a superficial reason. In actuality, the Reagan administration wanted to use this reason to press the Soviets to make substantial concessions at the Geneva disarmament talks. From a longer perspective, the U.S. strategic scheme is to hinder the Soviet Union with an even more gigantic nuclear arms race so as to deplete the USSR's financial and material resources, rendering it incapable of achieving its "accelerated development strategy" to expedite its economic, scientific, and technological development.

The Reagan administration's decision to abrogate the aforesaid treaty has caused concern and opposition from its allies and the U.S. people. During a recent meeting of NATO foreign ministers, the United States' Western European allies all strongly opposed abrogating the treaty. Many U.S. congressmen have openly stated that the treaty should be sustained. The house also adopted a resolution urging the Reagan administration to continue to abide by the treaty. Owing to this, some U.S. papers and journals have predicted that the Reagan administration will have trouble during the midterm election in November. Amid the voices of opposition at home and abroad, the U.S. Government itself has also showed differences and disconcerted steps. After the White House spokesman stated on 12 June that the treaty "no longer exists," Secretary of State Shultz made a denial the next day. After Gorbachev proposed on 16 June that as long as the United States agreed to abide by the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty for 15 years, the USSR would agree to cut the number of strategic nuclear weapons, Secretary of Defense Weinberger immediately rejected the proposal. However, in a speech at Glassboro on 19 June, Reagan praised the proposal, saying that the Soviet Union has "begun to make a serious effort," that "it could represent a turning point" in the arms-control talks, and that "this can be an opportunity for improving U.S.-Soviet relations."

Meanwhile, both the USSR and the United States have not slammed the door on a second summit. As the international situation continues to change, the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union will also be marked by frequent tension and relaxation according to their strategic and tactical needs. At any rate, the international community does not want to see a deterioration of the situation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/4048

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW DISCUSSES FRENCH NUCLEAR ARMS BEFORE MITTERAND'S VISIT

LD132214 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1730 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Vitaliy Andreyev commentary]

[Excerpts] President Francois Mitterand will travel to the USSR in the first 2 weeks of July for an official visit, it was announced in Moscow and Paris. This visit will form part of the Soviet-French summit dialogue, already marked last October by an important event, Mikhail Gorbachev's trip to France. It would be no exaggeration to say that the dangerous international situation urgently demands some responsible, well thought-out actions by all the states. The USSR and France, these two influential countries, permanent members of the UN Security Council, can contribute to the stabilization of the situation and a retreat from confrontation in favor of detente. What problems are at the origin of the special concerns of the Soviets and the French? Certainly, first of all, is that of curbing of the arms race and reducing nuclear potentials.

The USSR is in favor of a complete liquidation of nuclear weapons between now and the end of the century. Moscow does not limit itself to declarations of intent, but takes definite action in this direction. That is the case in particular of the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, in force for nearly one year. The USSR first of all invites the United States and other nuclear powers, France included, to follow its example, because the stopping of nuclear tests means the cessation of the perfection of nuclear weapons.

Take another aspect of the Soviet program, the liquidation of medium-range missiles in Europe. It is necessary, to be sure, to agree above all on the reduction of Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons. However, it must not be forgotten that France possesses a considerable nuclear potential. France's will to guarantee her security has always met with the USSR's understanding. But today it is impossible to assure security by a continued increase of nuclear weapons. Thus, in the course of his visit to France, Mikhail Gorbachev proposed starting direct discussion on medium-range weapons.

Nobody is raising the question of France's unilateral disarmament; nobody is trying to compromise her security. But it is necessary to cut the Gordian knot, and the quicker the better. It is important to act progressively, taking into account the mutual interests. The first task is to prevent the extension of the arms race into space and [words indistinct] convinced partisan of the nondeployment of space strike weapons. According to the statements of President Mitterrand, France is aware of the dangers inherent in the Star Wars program. Nevertheless, there are in France some personalities, including officials, who would not refrain from associating Paris in this (?very) dangerous adventure, an act which would without a doubt contribute to the destabilizing of the international situation.

Europe constitutes the priority for Moscow and Paris. The USSR and France have an interest in stabilizing the climate on the European Continent and reducing the military confrontation. Objectively, their positions on these issues coincide. This coincidence must be translated into concrete actions. The same applies in the case of the regional problems. The interests of the USSR and France [words indistinct]. Acting jointly or in parallel, Moscow and Paris could favor more than anything else, a political settlement of the conflicts and the complex situations.

In the USSR, the future of relations with France is looked at with optimism. The USSR and France belong, to be sure, to different military and political alliances; at times their interests diverge and are even opposed. Nevertheless, that does not prevent a wide dialogue, a constructive search for a solution to the problems, or cooperation. That is the USSR's constant approach in its relations with France.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1442



## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### PRAVDA STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF BRITISH, FRENCH NUCLEAR ARMS

PM241312 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 86 First Edition p 6

[Yu. Viktorov article: "In the Interests of Common Security"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to end the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and to remove the threat of a devastating war.

These efforts are based on a realistic program to eliminate nuclear weapons on earth by the end of this millenium. The series of specific measures includes a proposal to free Europe of American and Soviet medium-range missiles as early as the first phase of nuclear disarmament.

The urgency of this step is obvious. Military confrontation in Europe stands at a particularly high level. There are two major military-political groups -- NATO and the Warsaw Pact -- here, and colossal numbers of nuclear weapons have been stockpiled. The West European arsenals alone contain more than 7,000 nuclear combat munitions. These arsenals are being constantly updated and are becoming increasingly dangerous. New U.S. medium-range missiles are continuing to be sited on the territory of West European NATO countries.

States like Britain and France have also been embroiled in the nuclear arms race. Right now they could dispatch than 500 nuclear charges in a single launch.

Britain possesses 64 launchers for Polaris A3TK SLRM's capable of reaching targets at a distance of 3,500 km. The French nuclear forces consist of 18 silo-bases launchers for S-3 ballistic missiles with a range of 3,700 km and 6 missile-carrying atomic submarines in addition to airborne nuclear-weapon delivery vehicles. Five of these submarines are equipped with M-20 missiles with a range of 3,200 kilometers, and one with M-4 MIRV missiles (with a range of 4,500 km).

These states' nuclear armaments are being constantly modernized and built up. It is planned to reequip British missile-carrying submarines in the nineties with Trident-2 ballistic missiles purchased from the United States. The adoption of these missiles -- each carrying 8 warheads -- will increase the number of British nuclear charges carried on submarines by roughly 50 percent.

France intends to deploy mobile medium-range missile complexes in addition to its stationary medium-range missiles. A seventh submarine equipped with new M-5 ballistic missiles with a range of 6,000 km is being commissioned into the submarine fleet. Four more French submarines will be reequipped with M-4 missiles. Here the number of warheads on sea-launched missiles alone will almost double.



The total number of combat charges on British and French missiles could increase to around 1,200 by the mid-nineties. This fact objectively demonstrates that the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries cannot ignore the presence in Europe of the corresponding British and French nuclear arms. They have always been included in the balance of forces existing between the Warsaw Pact and NATO and been taken into consideration as a factor determining the strategic situation at the USSR-U.S. strategic arms limitation and reduction talks.

The substantial reduction of Soviet and American nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory and the elimination of those states' medium-range missiles in Europe as early as the first phase proposed by the USSR nuclear disarmament program objectively raises the question of the corresponding British and French armaments.

The proportion of British and French nuclear arms within the correlation of forces increases the more significant proposed reductions of nuclear arms on the Soviet and American sides.

Persistently searching for the slightest opportunity to make nuclear disarmament problems susceptible of practical solutions, the Soviet Union has found it possible to tackle the question of medium-range nuclear missiles without linking it directly to space and strategic arms. Showing a constructive attitude and large-scale compromise in its proposals, it has agreed not to compensate itself for the number of combat charges possessed by Britain and France during the reduction of USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe.

It is clear that in excluding the nuclear facilities possessed by America's NATO allies in Europe the USSR has the right to expect the United States to make a commitment to refrain from supplying its medium-range and strategic missiles to other countries and that Britain and France refrain from increasing the number of their own corresponding armaments. This is only fair, since otherwise the elimination of Soviet missiles could become essentially a unilateral measure and, effectively, unilateral disarmament. Such a measure would damage the security interests not only of the USSR but of its allies also.

However, with the aim of helping to free Europe of nuclear weapons, the USSR has taken a number of serious, practical steps in the recent past. In April 1985, a unilateral Soviet moratorium on deploying medium-range missiles in Europe and carrying out other countermeasures there was introduced. A considerable number of Soviet SS-20 missiles were taken off stand-by alert and their stationary installations dismantled.

In the struggle for nuclear disarmament the Soviet Union is persistently and creatively searching for new ways to achieve this lofty objective. This is shown by the proposal put forward by M.S. Gorbachev at his meeting with British parliamentarians on 26 May.

An official decision by Britain to eliminate its nuclear weapons would undoubtedly play a positive role in advancing toward an accord on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. In response to this the Soviet Union would be ready to make an equivalent reduction in its own nuclear potential.

If at the same time all foreign nuclear weapons were also removed from British territory the Soviet Union would guarantee that its nuclear means would never be targeted on British territory and never be used against Britain. The whole range of questions arising here could be the subject of discussion and elaboration of agreed decisions between the USSR and Britain.

The implementation of this proposal could substantially influence the situation in Europe and provide a positive boost to resolving the problems of nuclear disarmament.

Although the new Soviet initiative is directly addressed to the British Government, it should be clear that its implementation would point the way toward the path that must be followed if the lofty aims enshrined in the nuclear disarmament program are to be attained. In other words, the Soviet proposal opens up prospects for joint or parallel acts to achieve a suitable [adekvatnyy] reduction in nuclear potentials.

Efforts on the part of all European countries to implement the Warsaw Pact states' proposals on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe put forward at the Political Consultative Committee conference in Budapest could make an important contribution to normalizing the situation on the continent.

The appeal to NATO countries and all European states to reduce all components of ground troops and tactical strike aviation expresses the single will of the conference participants. These reductions would be implemented over the whole territory of Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. Operational-tactical nuclear armaments with a range (operational range) of up to 1,000 km would be subject to cuts at the same time as conventional armaments.

Putting these proposals forward negates the fabrications about a threat to the West from the Warsaw Pact if nuclear weapons are eliminated in Europe. They show once again the defensive nature of the Warsaw Pact states' military doctrine.

Mindful of the realities of the nuclear space age, when it is virtually impossible to build security just for oneself and when the security of each state or group of states depends on the security of others, the Soviet Union and the other socialist states are proposing specific political steps in the interests of common security.

The problem of confrontation on the European Continent, a problem not of the USSR's making, must be solved, and the sooner the better. The Soviet Union urges the European states to promote this.

The solution of the task of nuclear and other kinds of disarmament will depend in many respects on how the European states conduct themselves. It is very important that a first step be taken in Europe. It is clear to everyone that if the first, most difficult step is taken, both a second and third step will be taken. Mankind will see not a faint ray of hope but realistic prospects, not bellicose rhetoric but specific deeds in defense of peace, not the economic burden of militarism but the first fruits of disarmament.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1442

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### MOSCOW ON U.S. DEPLOYMENTS IN JAPAN

#### Okinawa Exercise

OW180629 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 17 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" program; presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Large-scale landing exercises with the participation of Marines and warships of the U.S. Seventh Fleet have begun in the Japanese island of Okinawa. The Pentagon has decided to transfer another squadron of F-16 fighter bombers, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, to the U.S. air base in Honshu Island ahead of schedule. These are just two more facts among a multitude attesting to increasing U.S.- Japanese military potential.

In one of our reviews we cited a report by the Japanese newspaper AKAHATA that the armed forces of Japan and the United States were working out plans for a joint attack on the Soviet Kuril Islands and Sakhalin in case of so-called extraordinary circumstances. A number of additional details about these plans have come to light. According to the same newspaper, the commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, General Kelly, admitted for the first time in January, that the Pentagon, with the help of its allies, intended to strike a blow at Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands in the event, as he said, of a military flare-up in any other region, like central Europe for example.

According to reports from Tokyo, the area occupied by U.S. military bases on Hokkaido has tripled. The deployment of U.S. fighter and bomber aircraft in the north of Japan is going ahead at full speed. Provocative exercises for a strike group of U.S. ships are planned in the Sea of Japan.

It is appropriate to mention, in relation to this, that the United States has rejected our proposal to reduce, on the basis of parity, or better still to liquidate entirely, the Soviet and U.S. nuclear forces on the European Continent. It demands that the Soviet Union liquidate similar forces beyond the Urals, that is, in the Asian part of our country.

What does this mean? It turns out that the U.S.- Japanese militarists are actively arming themselves, whereas at the same time they would like to see complete disarmament on our side. Obviously, they will not live to see this. At their Budapest meeting, the Warsaw Pact member-states declared responsibly that they would never, under any circumstances, begin military actions against any state, be it in Europe or any other part of the world, provided they themselves were not objects of aggression.

This is our military doctrine. As far as the madmen who run around with plans to launch attacks against the Soviet Far East are concerned, well, the Soviet Union has more than enough strength to bring them to their senses.

#### F-16's to Misawa

OW211003 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Dmitriyev commentary: "Why is the Pentagon in Such a Hurry?"]

[Text] According to a KYODO report, the United States plans to complete deployment of F-16 fighter bombers to the Misawa base 1 year earlier than originally scheduled. This has been revealed by General Ellis in a congressional public hearing. Our commentator Dmitriyev writes as follows:

The Pentagon is working to complete the deployment of F-16's to Misawa 1 year earlier than originally scheduled. Why is it in such a hurry? An excuse the United States always uses to justify its war preparations is what it terms "Soviet military buildups." However, Soviet leader Mr Gorbachev reaffirmed at a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee held several days ago in Moscow that the USSR will not increase the number of its intermediate-range missiles in Asia. Consequently, the so-called Soviet threat cannot be a reason this time, as it could not be in previous cases. Why, then, is the Pentagon in such a hurry?

It must probably be seeking to complete one project and quickly move on to the next. Details of the next project are already known. According to General Ellis, the United States plans to build a munitions magazine in Misawa. Furthermore, it will not ask Japan to share the cost of the projected construction. What makes it so generous? General Ellis made it clear that the facility will be for offensive purposes. In reality, however, the U.S. military presence itself in Japan is totally for offensive purposes.

The United States maintains more than 100 military bases and facilities in Japan and has nearly 50,000 military personnel stationed there. The overall mission of this military power is by no means to defend Japan against any nonexistent threat. The mission is to keep its sights on the Far Eastern region of the USSR and on other socialist countries and developing countries and to launch attacks at an initial stage of what Washington considers an emergency, if such a situation develops. The Pentagon simply does not care what may happen to those bases following such attacks, because having retaliatory attacks directed to those bases far away from the continental United States is what U.S. strategists are planning. Misawa Air Force Base is the most naked symbol of the aggressive intention of the U.S. military presence in Japan.

If Japan is an unsinkable aircraft carrier for the United States as the Pentagon believes, F-16's deployed in Misawa form its major offensive power. Those fighter bombers are nuclear capable and have Soviet territories within their range; their mission is to carry out bombings or even nuclear attacks against the Soviet Union. U.S. military representatives repeatedly made statements to that effect.

Are such weapons necessary for Japan's defense? Would the Japanese people feel that they are more secure with these weapons deployed on a base in their country? We doubt it.

During his recent meeting with Japanese Foreign Minister Abe, General Secretary Gorbachev said that it is strange that Japan says nothing about U.S. nuclear missiles targeted on the eastern region of the USSR while complaining about Soviet missiles in Asia. The Soviet position has been proven correct by the report that 50 F-16's, which are nuclear capable, will be deployed to Misawa sometime this year. At a time when the USSR has reaffirmed its position of not increasing the number of its missiles in Asia, the United States is building up its offensive power in Japan in haste. This U.S. deed makes one think anew about from where the real threat to peace and security in the Far East comes.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1442



## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### BRIEFS

TASS ON 'TOMAHAWK' TEST--New York, 15 Jun (TASS)--A spokesman for the U.S. Navy reported that another test of the "Tomahawk" cruise missile equipped with MIRV'ed warheads was conducted in the south-west of the U.S. A missile launched by a mobile booster from a military base in California, flew at a low altitude for over 300 miles to the test site White Sands, New Mexico, hitting a number of targets by its warheads. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 15 Jun 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1442

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S. CONTINUING 'SECRET' CW RESEARCH

LD170616 Moscow TASS in English 0607 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] New York June 17 TASS -- TASS correspondent Maxim Knyazkov reports:

The newspaper "PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER" has learnt that Thomas Jefferson University in Philadelphia had been awarded 4.3 million dollars by the Pentagon to set up a centre for the study of toxins.

Though the leaders of the new centre are seeking to assert that investigations will be of purely academic nature, the very fact of the Pentagon's participation shows the reverse. Local observers point out that it is another evidence of the fact that the Reagan administration is continuing secret explorations to develop and stockpile bacteriological weapons in violation of the 1925 Geneva protocol and the 1972 U.N. convention, which banned these arms.

Thomas Jefferson University is not the only higher educational establishment in the USA used by the Pentagon to implement this sinister programme. In 1984 it was reported at a peace conference in Baltimore that a laboratory of Maryland State University received an order from the Pentagon to investigate into influence of the typhoid virus on man.

According to the U.S. press, the USA has been conducting for over 30 years secret work on developing bacteriological weapons. A laboratory of the U.S. Department of the Army situated in Fort Detrick (Maryland state) has become one of the main centres of this work. It was actively engaged in investigations of viruses of anthrax, encephalitis, plague and other acute diseases.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S. TURNING 'BLIND EYE' TO LEAKING CHEMICAL WEAPONS DEPOTS

LD120925 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] New York, 11 Jun (TASS)—The U.S. authorities turn a blind eye to dangerous dumps of obsolete armaments, also of chemical weapons, that were left by the U.S. military all over the territory of the United States and that pose a serious hazard for the population. This is indicated again by the facts of criminal negligence with regard to such "burials" of lethal arms from the Environmental Protection Agency, the facts that came to light. Information was leaked into the press that one of the laboratories of the agency which is called upon to eliminate possible sources of contamination of the environment has been situated for many years in Edison, New Jersey, on the territory that was formerly an army depot, and that is contaminated with toxic substances and radiation.

The "Raritan" army arsenal was situated there from 1917 to 1964. Ammunition, explosives and chemical weapons were kept there. Turning over that plot of land to other agencies, the Pentagon saw no need for spending on removing obsolete armaments, posing mortal danger, beyond the limits of one of the most densely populated states of the U.S. For the sake of appearances these armaments were buried on the spot. The federal and local authorities did not interfere in the affairs of the military, and thus showed most criminal connivance. As the newspaper PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER writes, some ten hundred people now work on the territory that was formerly an army dump, and where huge canisters with toxic gas, chemical bombs, containers with toxic substances are rusting underground. The source of an enhanced radiation, twice or thrice the normal level, has not yet been established.

And enhanced radiation was discovered by chance, when one of the laboratory's employees decided to show to his colleagues a G-M counter and it started sounding an alarm signal.

Even now that these facts evoked protests of the public, the Environmental Protection Agency refuses to do anything to remove the chemical weapons dump. Instead of that is hastened to declare that the scope of contamination in Edison gives no ground for concern. Nevertheless, according to press reports, even the U.S. Department of Defense regards this noxious dump one of the most dangerous among the 7,000 such "burial places" of obsolete armaments left by the military in various areas of the United States.

/9738  
CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: PRESS CONFERENCE AT USIA SEEKS TO JUSTIFY U.S. CW BUILDUP

LD131645 Moscow TASS in English 1300 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 13 Jun (TASS)--With protests mounting in the United States and abroad against the U.S. Administration's dangerous plans to start massively building up arsenals of chemical weapons, official Washington is trying, cost what it may, to "substantiate" and "justify" its dangerous actions.

A press conference, held at the United States Information Agency (USIA), was a stage in that campaign. Taking part in the conference were Deputy Assistant Defense Secretaries Thomas Welch and Douglas Fait.

Representatives of the U.S. Defense Department asserted that the decision on the buildup of American arsenals of chemical weapons is attributed to the impasse at the negotiations on that problem within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. And hence the conclusion that the United States can without a twinge of conscience create new generations of chemical weapons.

This is a distorted logic, indeed. It is exactly through the fault of the United States that all efforts that have been undertaken and are being undertaken with a view of banning and eliminating chemical weapons were brought to zero. Suffice it to recall that Washington unilaterally interrupted bilateral Soviet-American negotiations on that problem which took place on the USSR's initiatives in 1976-1980.

Beneath criticism is also another "argument" in favor of building up chemical arsenals, which says that such a buildup is necessary to the United States in order to... reduce the probability of a nuclear war in Europe.

The U.S. arsenals of chemical toxic agents have now reached great proportions. According to the press, the United States has 150,000 tons of warfare agents and 3 million toxic gas shells. And therefore nobody can be misled by the U.S. Administration's attempts to find a pretext for a still greater buildup of these arsenals, meanwhile refusing to take a constructive stand in the question of prohibition of chemical weapons.

/9738  
CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW TV DISCUSSES CW DANGERS TO FRG

LD222007 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 22 Jun 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Excerpts] [Gerasimov] Forty-five years have gone by. In remembering 1941, we are not going to repeat the mistakes of those textbook generals who prepared for the war by preparing for the last war, not the next one. The idiocy of trench warfare was the surprise brought by World War I. Europe put its young people through the mincing-machine of trench warfare. Under the impressions produced by this senseless carnage, Romain Rolland then called for an international peace to be created. The surprise of World War II was the mobile crematoria in the form of mass bombings of Hamburg, Dresden, and Tokyo and also the reduction to ashes of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher, and Albert Einstein, the U.S. scientist, issued a manifesto under the impression produced by this madness and called upon people to learn how to think in a new way.

But so far people are not thinking in a new way, and one of the reasons why is to be found in the burden of familiar ideas. In the past, more always meant better: more elephants in ancient times; more sabers in times not quite so ancient; more guns during the last war; and more soldiers at all times. Does this still hold true today? For example, is it necessary today to accumulate chemical weapons? Would it not be more sensible to reject them?

Those in the Pentagon who admire chemical weapons point out their special qualities: Present-day nerve gases work with certainty and leave no wounded so there is less suffering on the part of the victims and fewer things for those around them to worry about. A convincing balance-sheet. But the United States is not going to put these weapons into operation in its own country, they have been made for Europe.

[Correspondent Vladimir Kondratyev] What has to be done in order to deliver Europe from one of the most dangerous means of mass destruction this century? This question was discussed at a conference at the University of Mainz. Those involved were social democrats, trade unions, prominent scientists in the FRG and public organizations that oppose the presence of chemical weapons on their country's territory. Nowhere in the world is there as large a concentration of them as in the FRG.



U.S. military strategy does not envisage these weapons being used on its own territory. In the Pentagon's plans the role of bridgehead in any war of chemical destruction is given to Europe, and primarily to the Federal Republic. Inconsistency is the distinctive feature of the position taken by the FRG on this issue. In what it says the government advocates a world having a smaller quantity of weapons, including chemical weapons. In fact, Bonn has given the green light to the commencement of binary weapon production and has set the example for Washington's other NATO allies. At the same time, in order to pacify the public that was alarmed by this step, the ruling circles of the United States and the FRG agreed on a maneuver to divert attention.

This is Rheinland-Pfalz, one of the most picturesque parts of the country as far as landscape is concerned. It is a favorite spot for tourists. It is difficult to believe that silent death lurks in these thick forests. A U.S. military base is in the village of Fischbach.

Behind barbed wire, under conditions of total secrecy, is almost the whole U.S. arsenal of chemical weapons on the continent. It is estimated here that the stocks range between 5,000 and 10,000 metric tons, enough to wipe out 3 billion people at one time. Some of the chemicals have already been stored at Fischbach for decades.

This is accompanied by the danger of leaks and contamination of wide areas. The Americans have thus decided to remove the obsolete weapons, subsequently replacing them with the improved binary version. Bonn is trying to depict this as a concession by the United States to its own wishes. A statement was also made that binary weapons will be deployed only during so-called crisis situations. No one here knows exactly what is hidden behind this wording. Washington can use virtually any provocation like the recent one against Libya in order to justify the stocking of binary weapons. Furthermore it will be virtually impossible to monitor this process. As was pointed out at the Mainz conference, if one of the components is sited at Kreuznach and the other at Kaiserslautern, it will be impossible to prove the presence of weapons that could be prepared for action at any moment.

The fears of FRG residents are not groundless. It has become known that three points for deployment of the new binary weapons have been chosen in Rheinland-Pfalz, North Bavaria, and in place of the Fischbach base. The chemical death production-lines are due to start operating soon in the United States. As in the case with the Pershing and cruise missiles, hopes are being placed on the principle of produce and deploy first, and then hold talks from a position of strength. But more and more people in the FRG believe that a totally different approach is needed, or else the problem of chemical weapons will never be resolved.

A press conference on chemical weapons took place in Washington a few days ago. It was said that these have to be produced because the Soviet Union allegedly has a superiority in chemical weapons and also because -- and this is the main thing -- these are new weapons of improved quality. Here, if you please, one clearly sees the second reason for the arms race. The first reason, you remember, was the thinking inherited from the past that the more weapons there are the better it is: the second reason is the calculation that the more effective the weapons are the better it is. This is temptation by technology. Oscar Wilde considered that the best way of getting rid of temptation was to give into it. This is what they are doing, they are giving in to it. The mechanism works like this; the technology makes new weapons possible; profits to be made make them something to be desired; and cabinet strategy declares them to be essential.

Now about the references made at the Washington press conference to Soviet superiority in chemical weapons, and also in missiles, tanks, under nearly every heading: This is all one great lie. This was discussed -- it was mentioned again on 20 June -- at the joint session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A book appeared recently in New York. The book is called "The Myth of Soviet Military Supremacy." It is written by Tom Gervasi, the director of the Military Studies Center in New York. He draws two conclusions: first, using the figures he proves that there is no Soviet supremacy; and second, putting aside these figures he proves that there is no military significance in nuclear arithmetic. He writes that many Americans must ask themselves the following question: What are we going to do with supremacy if we achieve it? No one has yet suggested an answer to this important question. The reason, maybe, is that those who know the answer know that there is no such thing as military supremacy, that today all one can do is constantly build up military might, but that no matter how much of it one does build up it will never give nuclear power the ability to force another to submit to someone else's will.

What, then, are the reasons for the senseless rush toward the abyss? We have already mentioned an incorrect idea of the importance of quantitative and qualitative parameters in our nuclear age.

All the same, the author of this book writes, all the same there is a third reason that has to be recognized: the fact that arms production is the most profitable sector of the U.S. economy. The arms business, like any other, or like a cancer cell, strives to grow and, Gervasi writes, it exaggerates the armaments requirements in order to justify its growth, exaggerating the threat that they have to withstand. Thus progress is warped, it works to people's detriment instead of to their benefit. Prometheus gave people fire. They used this fire to keep warm and to cook their food. Then they discovered the auto-da-fe and invented napalm. Finally they split the atom. To begin with, its forces were released to do great damage to people: then they began to tame it. This is a difficult but necessary thing to do, and if it is done by joint efforts it is easier.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA NOTES SPANISH TV SHOW ON U.S., UK CBW RESEARCH

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 86 p 5

[Article by V. Vernikov, IZVESTIYA Madrid Correspondent: "Fort Detrich: Dangerous Virus"]

[Text] Reporting entitled, "The Secret Biological Threat," was shown on [Telebyektiv], a popular spanish television program. The discussion about the stepped up development of biological weapons by the U. S. militarists and intelligence services [spetssluzhby] literally terrorized the television audience, exactly as several years ago Americans themselves were shocked by what was taking place in their country. Truly, none of them knew that special Pentagon elements had tested new types of bacteriological weapons on experimental rabbits, on passengers in an airport in Washington, on the New York Metro, in barracks, cafe's and other places where people congregate, and then in aerosol form sprayed them over San Francisco Bay, infecting thousands of people, although it was possible to document only the death of one person, (E. Nevin), a participant in the operation.

These and other facts which the television film discusses confirm with complete reliability that the U. S. began systemic research on development and use of chemical and bacteriological weapons during World War II. In later years the Americans involved former nazi scientists in this work, as well as Japanese specialists from the infamous "Detachment 731," which tested its barbarous "discoveries" on prisoners of war. The production of bacteria and viruses of typhus, cholera, tuberculosis, bubonic plague, smallpox, dysentery and many other most dangerous diseases was carried out in specialized centers such as, for example, Fort Detrich, Maryland and Dugway Proving Grounds, Utah. It is there that even today intensive experiments are being conducted with one of the most dangerous and toxic viruses of Anthrax, which was transferred to the Americans by Japanese researchers after "Detachment 731" was revealed.

The film also recalls that the U. S., along with Great Britain, at the very height of the war carried out at the same location, Fort Detrich, and in the British Biological Weapons Center in Porton-Down (southeast England) in parallel with Japanese fanatics, efforts to create bombs filled with spores of Anthrax. These spores remain in an active state for approximately 100 years and are capable of destroying any living organism. One of the bombs was

tested on the island of Greenard in the north of Scotland. It's first victims were a herd of sheep, which began to die already the next day, and shepherds, who died from lung ailments on the second and third day, which forced the British authorities to close Greenard altogether for living and even visiting for many decades, all the way to the present time.

William Basil, leader of a center at Fort Detrich, discusses "Teleobyektiv:"

"Yes, a secret program for creating bacteriological weapons was begun here during World War II. Several types of weapons were created then, but were not used in the war. Today's efforts, including those with the Anthrax virus, are being carried out within the framework of a super-secret program under the code name, "MK-Ultra," and one of the main aims of the experiments is to use viruses to control the psyche of people, paralyze their will, and as a result destroy them," he asserted. "There is no antidote to the Anthrax virus and an individual infected with it is doomed."

In 1969, under pressure of international public opinion, President Nixon was forced officially to ban work on the development of bacteriological weapons in the U. S. However, in fact they did not cease for a single day. As the Spanish journalists prove, since the current Washington administration came into power these works have begun to be carried out still more intensively, under the pretext of the need to conduct them for "purely defensive and research purposes." It is precisely then that tremendous new allocations from the federal budget were also allocated.

"In our reporting we reconstructed events through documents, both rather long ago and quite recent," discusses the film's author, the well known Spanish television journalist, Baltasar Margo, director of the "Teleobyektiv" program. "We were aided by the fact that two years ago the question of the production of chemical and bacteriological weapons in the U. S. was discussed in the American Senate after a well-known scandal in Canada, when unexpectedly facts came to life about the testing of toxic substances on sick people in one of the hospitals in Montreal.

This took place, continues Margo, in 1984 within the framework of Project Number 68 of the "MK-Ultra" program. But we had hardly started to speak about this with Pentagon officials, trying to obtain any sort of new information, when we understood that our undertaking was not a simple one. First, this was because none of those sick survived. Second, the results were so adroitly entangled by the American intelligence services, that not even the names were preserved of the narcotics and bacteriological substances with which totally unsuspecting people were inoculated, we were assured, and, moreover, their names had also disappeared without a trace. Third, even the Canadian lawyer (Joseph Rau) hired by the relatives of the victims, refused to give us their names, which, of course, he knows. He cited a special decision by the U. S. Congress which prohibited dissemination of more detailed information about this scandal in which the CIA and the Pentagon turned out to be involved.

Nevertheless, the Spanish television filming group succeeded in obtaining unique sequences, which recorded the moment this matter was heard in the U. S. Senate, at which then CIA director Colby finally was forced to acknowledge



that American "knights of the cloak and dagger" had violated all existing laws, flouted the presidential veto and operated on the territory of another country, without informing its government, the hospital doctors or the sick themselves. At the Senate sessions it was also stated aloud for the first time that the CIA was involved in attempts to murder leading political figures of foreign states which it objected to, and to undertake bacteriological warfare against Cuba on the territory of which bacteria and viruses of hog cholera, dengue fever, smallpox and other dangerous diseases were sprayed.

Former CIA employee Scott Barnes talks to "Telebyektiv:"

"At one time the leadership assigned me to test the action and effectiveness of several types of bacteriological weapons in Central America," he asserts. "Before this for many years I engaged in fabricating evidence about the supposed instances of the use of these weapons by the Soviet Union in Laos and Kampuchea. I am prepared to present secret documents and instructions from my chiefs on this account to any authoritative commission or organization which is independent of the U. S. government."

"When we accidentally 'got lost' in the American Fort Detrich Center," states B. Magro, "where we were allowed to take only landscape shots, on the gates of one of the prohibited zones we saw a warning tablet: 'Danger! Anthrax -- Active Virus.' Unfortunately, we were interfered from filming this tablet, but we saw with our own eyes that which we were attempting to do: To prove that the U. S. is continuing to create new types of bacteriological weapons, not at all for defensive purposes."

Bruce Morrison, Congressman from Connecticut, talks to "Telebyektiv:"

"During the past two years congress has repeatedly rejected attempts by President Reagan to increase openly the production of chemical and bacteriological weapons. Unfortunately, the President did not hear our voice and it is entirely obvious, since in the current budget more funds have been allocated for these purposes than ever before. Just the same we hope that he will not succeed in circumventing us. Congress has the authority to decide what activity the army or the Department of Defense is allowed to conduct, but, unfortunately, we lack the capability to control the implementation of these decisions. And this is extremely dangerous."

The film particularly emphasizes that U. S. activity in the field of biological weapons is a violation of a number of the most important international legal documents, and in particular of the convention on prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of reserves of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and about their destruction (1972). The final sequences of the film sound like a warning: "The threat of biological war is just as dangerous as that of nuclear war. With but one difference: much less is known about it." The Spanish television journalists did everything possible so that more would be known.

9069

CS0: 5200/1397



CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: CHEMICAL WEAPONS SEMINAR SPONSORED BY DUTCH GOVERNMENT

Seminar Opens

LD041407 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] The Hague, 4 Jun (TASS)--An international seminar on problems of chemical arms control opened here today. It is attended by delegations from 45 countries. The Soviet delegation is led by the representative of the USSR to the UN Conference on Disarmament, Viktor Israelyan.

The purpose of the seminar is to give a new additional impetus to the talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The delegates will concentrate attention on main factors hindering the signing of a comprehensive treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons, and discuss measures of verification and monitoring of the production of chemicals at civilian enterprises.

The government of Holland is the initiator of the three-day seminar. It would like to demonstrate in practice how multi-purpose chemical production can be submitted to monitoring offering the example of the existing national verification procedure the principles of which could be used in possible international agreements.

European Opposition to CW Noted

LD062215 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Eduard Kovalev commentary]

[Text] An international seminar on chemical weapons has ended in the Hague in which a Soviet delegation also took part. Here is a Mayak commentary. International affairs journalist Eduard Kovalev is at the microphone.

[Kovalev] The speeches of the participants in the seminar in The Hague showed that the European people are deeply worried about the latest U.S. plans to saturate the territory of the NATO countries with new types of chemical weapons, in particular binary ones. It is well known that the Pentagon has planned the modernization of U.S. chemical weapons already located in Europe.

14 July 1986

Referring to a sort of U.S. lagging behind in the field of chemical weapons, Washington officialdom has set in motion the claim of the necessity of upgrading chemical weapons in Europe. Thus, the United States wants to complete with chemical weapons the notorious NATO military triad that includes conventional, tactical nuclear and strategic nuclear weapons.

European public representatives and activists of the antiwar movement point to the fact that the dangerous nature of chemical weapons put them on a level with other means of mass extermination. The Europeans are keenly aware of the fatal role chemical weapons, in particular binary weapons which at present are being forced on the NATO allies of the United States, can play in their densely populated continent.

For Europe, they can serve perfectly as a first-strike weapon, equal to nuclear weapons. Such a prospect is giving rise to energetic, broad counteraction in West European countries. The Netherlands and Denmark have already spoken against deploying binary weapons on their territory. Greece is coming out to keep the Balkans free of chemical weapons. Finally, several days ago, the Belgian parliament, in spite of the decision of the Belgian Government, turned down by 109 votes to 73 the planned deployment of the latest chemical weapons on its territory.

The parliamentarians called upon the governments of Belgium and of the other NATO partners to aspire to an international agreement that would place a total ban on the production and use of chemical weapons. At the seminar in The Hague, the position of the Soviet Union and of the other countries of the socialist community was understood. This position is most clear. Let us remind you of the fact that we are consistently struggling for a total stoppage of the production of chemical weapons, for the quickest possible and total elimination of these weapons and of the industrial basis for their production, and for a final and unreserved ban on chemical weapons.

#### Verification Discussed

LD061949 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Text] The Hague June 6 TASS -- An international seminar of experts on banning chemical weapons was held here on June 4-6. It was organized by the Netherland's Foreign Ministry. The aim of the seminar is to promote the development of methods of verification of keeping from production of chemical weapons at enterprises of the chemical industry in the context of the talks on a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons underway at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

Taking part in the seminar were delegations of 46 countries, among them the delegation of the Soviet Union led by USSR representative at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament Viktor Israelyan. The Soviet delegation emphasized the new large-scale Soviet proposals aimed at an early conclusion of a convention to eliminate by the end of the current century one of the most horrible kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1423

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

### FRG AGREES WITH U.S. ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

#### Government Defends NATO Vote

LD151643 Hamburg DPA in German 1509 GMT 15 May 86

[Text] Bonn, 15 May (DPA)--The Federal Government is saying "yes," through NATO, to the production by the United States of new chemical weapons, aimed at bringing increased pressure on the Soviet Union to agree to a worldwide ban on chemical weapons. The Federal Government used this short formula in the Bundestag today to defend its NATO vote and the special agreement with the Americans. Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) and Defense Minister Manfred Woerner (CDU) pointed out the fact that the United States has renounced production since 1969, whereas the Soviet Union, Woerner said, has meanwhile increased its stock "to several (hundred thousand) metric tons."

Spokesman for the opposition attacked the government's account as covering up a new round of arming. "At some point one must say no," said SPD disarmament expert Egon Bahr, who rejected agreement with the NATO armed forces objective [streitkraefteziel], because this would mean that for the first time Bonn would have joint responsibility for a new round in the arms spiral.

This armed forces objective notes that the new production of chemical weapons lies in the West's defense interest. Only after agreement will the U.S. Congress approve the new production of binary chemical weapons from 1 December 1987, if a worldwide and verifiable total ban cannot be negotiated with the Soviet Union by then. But this chance was described as "unfortunately doubtful" by CDU Deputy Karl Lamers from the experience of disarmament so far.

All spokesmen, however, welcomed the German-American agreement to withdraw from the Federal Republic--the only country where they are stationed--the old stocks of JUSA [expansion unknown] poison gas--regarded as particularly dangerous, which are apparently stored in the Rhineland Palatinate. No German Federal Government has ever achieved what Chancellor Kohl was able to agree with President Reagan, Woerner said that is: 1. Withdrawal of the old chemical weapons; 2. introduction of new weapons only with German agreement; and 3. that such weapons will no longer be stationed exclusively in the Federal Republic.

There would not be a deployment exchange--"new for old," promised Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, who was present in Tokyo when Kohl and Reagan

reached agreement on the withdrawal of old chemical weapons and the right of veto on storing new weapons. Genscher stressed the hope that the Soviet Union, which as a result of the stop in production [by the United States] has been "at an (advantage) for 17 years," would be ready for negotiations on a worldwide and controlled ban, now that Gorbachev had spoken for the first time of verification possibilities.

As a result of the government decision the door was being opened to a worldwide arms drive with new binary chemical weapons, noted Karsten Voigt, foreign affairs spokesman for the SPD Bundestag group. The SPD wants to keep at least Europe free from chemical weapons over the long term. Voigt expressed mistrust about the government's assertions about the possibilities of objecting to new weapons, and said that there already existed other contingency plans. A strategy of chemical retaliation is contrary to German interests. In the view of his parliamentary group colleague Hermann Scheer, following the German NATO vote the use of means of mass destruction in Europe had only become more likely. Bonn is presenting not a disarmament package "but a pack of tricks."

Chancellor Kohl has reintroduced the idea of calling an international conference to discuss joint measures that would guarantee a higher level of safety in nuclear power plants and more stringent safeguards against the involuntary release of radioactive substances from nuclear power plants in the event of an accident. The message recalls that the FRG proposal falls within the framework of the initiatives on which the Italian Government is also working. It reintroduces the idea put forth by Craxi in Tokyo at the end of the summit of the seven most industrialized Western countries.

Greens Deputy Torsten Lange accused the Federal Government of speaking untruths. The old stocks of chemical weapons were not being withdrawn for disarmament reasons but because they had become technically completely unsafe and dangerous to their guards. "Chemical waste management is not chemical disarmament, particularly when it goes hand in hand with modernization." If the Federal Government agrees to the so-called NATO armed forces target it makes itself jointly responsible for a new round in the arms drive.

The Bundestag welcomed the agreement between Kohl and Reagan in a resolution passed with the CDU/CSU coalition groups' majority. The resolution affirms the goal of achieving a worldwide ban on chemical weapons as soon as possible.

#### Woerner Comments

DW160828 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 180 GMT 15 May 86

[Excerpt from speech by Defense Minister Manfred Woerner during the Bundestag debate on U.S. chemical weapons--recorded]

[Text] The United States will no longer insist on its rights emanating from the 1954 troop stationing treaty as far as chemical weapons are concerned. That is a considerable political gain for our sovereignty. That also spells the end of singularizing the FRG as the only European NATO country on whose

soil chemical weapons are stockpiled. That will come to an end. And finally, the chemical weapons that are to be withdrawn from the FRG by no later than 1992, if the final manufacturing stage in the United States can begin in December 1987, will not be replaced.

Proposals for zones free from chemical weapons in parts of Europe are not suitable substitutes for the discontinuation of chemical armament under an agreement that would reliably eliminate all types of chemical weapons, all depots, and all manufacturing facilities.

/12913

CSO: 5200/2690



CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FRG PAPER CITES NATO CONCERN ABOUT BONN'S POSSIBLE VETO RIGHT

DW121047 Bonn DIE WELT in German 13 May 86 p 5

[C. Graf Brockdorff article: "NATO Concerned About Bonn's Veto Over C-Weapons"]

[Excerpt] Brussels--The reported agreement between Chancellor Kohl and President Reagan on chemical weapons is considered problematic by NATO. Military circles call it "not thoroughly thought out" and as "possibly having grave consequences." The presence of U.S. troops in Germany is involved.

Granting the right to decide on deployment of chemical weapons in Europe in a crisis cannot be limited to the FRG, it was said. The right claimed by the FRG must also be granted to other countries. In that connection the Netherlands and Denmark were mentioned.

The situation creates the danger that in an emergency the FRG would be left alone by the alliance partners, should weak governments veto the deployment of chemical weapons in Europe. "The singularizing" Bonn wants to avoid, would thus be supported in practice.

The starting point of the criticism is the need for chemical deterrence. According to military opinion, it alone is effective in keeping an adversary from using nerve gas against the West. It could only be implemented if U.S. chemical weapons were available in Europe in an emergency. Should that not be the case, nuclear weapons would have to be used.

The reason for the agreement between Kohl and Reagan, which has not yet officially been confirmed, was the U.S. Congress demand that NATO agree to U.S. forces targeting for chemical weapons deterrence. It was envisaged that the United States would resume production of chemical weapons, which was discontinued two decades ago.

/12913  
CSO: 3200/2690

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FRG NEWSPAPER COMMENTS ON NATO CBW DECISION

DW230847 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 23 May 86 p 3

[Ulrich Mackensen editorial: "On the Old Track"]

[Excerpts] The decision of the North Atlantic alliance to approve the production of new chemical weapons by the United States causes discomfort.

Negotiations have been in progress in Geneva for quite some time to ban chemical weapons. But the superpowers obviously are not really interested in their elimination. Consequently, the Europeans ultimately will again be left holding the bag. It is no consolation that chemical weapons were not used in World War II even though both sides had them, because the two sides realized that such weapons also affect the user.

Actually, people with common sense would have expected a different development, what with the Chernobyl catastrophe. They could have expected, for example, a consideration of the question whether nuclear deterrence can "work" at all, considering the effect of the use of nuclear weapons on "friend" and "foe" alike—an effect similar to that of chemical weapons. It would presumably be interesting to have public opinion pollsters ascertain the impact of Chernobyl on the credibility of nuclear deterrence. The conclusion then would have to be how such a strategy could be replaced with another, at least on a medium-term basis.

Instead, NATO has approved the production of chemical weapons and thereby intensifies the uncertainty of and insecurity of the people. The alliance missed its chance of stepping out of the well-worn tracks for a change and to test whether or not Washington would have been prepared to withdraw its corroded chemical weapons from the Federal Republic without anything in return. In the face of that development the NATO appeal for complete disarmament of chemical weapons looks like sheer mockery.

/12913

C80: 5200/2690

## CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

### USSR'S ISRAELYAN SPEAKS ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

#### Press Conference at CD

AU191256 Paris AFP in English 1251 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Excerpt] Geneva, June 19 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union does not intend to produce new chemical arms and will hold talks with the United States next month about halting their production altogether and destroying those in stock, top Soviet disarmament negotiator Viktor Israelyan said here Thursday.

Mr. Israelyan also told journalists after a session of the disarmament conference in Geneva that Washington, which recently announced it would resume production of chemical arms, already had the world's largest chemical arsenal.

He said the U.S. arsenal contained 55 million tonnes of those arms, but stressed that Moscow would not be pressured by the U.S. decision to resume production of chemical arms, reportedly after a 17-year lapse.

Mr. Israelyan also said his talks Wednesday with British officials in London on reducing chemical arms arsenals had been "serious and very tense".

#### In Bonn with Kvitsinskiy

LD142120 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 1700 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text] The Soviet Union is convinced that a treaty on the worldwide ban of chemical weapons can be concluded even before the production of such weapons by the United States. This was emphasized today by Kvitsinskiy, the USSR ambassador to Bonn, and by Israelyan, the permanent representative at the disarmament talks in Geneva. At a press conference held by the congress for a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe, organized by the Rhineland-Palatinate DGB, [German Trade Union Federation], Kvitsinskiy and Israelyan emphasized in Mainz the Soviet Union's willingness for on-site verification. Israelyan added that should the United States begin the production of new types of chemical weapons this would have a negative effect on the Geneva efforts.

British-Soviet Talks

LD190952 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] London, June 19 TASS -- Soviet-British consultations on questions connected with the banning of chemical weapons were held here on June 18. The sides discussed a number of questions touched upon at the talks held within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

From the Soviet side the consultations were attended by the member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Viktor Israelyan and from the British side -- by the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Office Timothy Renton.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

SECURITY COUNCIL DECISION--Bonn, 13 May (DPA)--In the future chemical weapons will not be deployed on German territory without the assent of the Federal Government, either in times of peace or of tension. A relevant agreement between Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and U.S. President Ronald Reagan was taken note of, confirmed and made the basis of future NATO resolutions by the Federal Security Council in Bonn today, it was learned from informed quarters. The secret sessions of the Federal Security Council, which take place mainly in connection with cabinet sessions, are not officially confirmed. Government spokesman Friedhelm Ost told journalists today merely that the council discussed issues relating to chemical weapons and established the Federal Government's position. [Excerpt] [Hamburg DPA in German 1413 GMT 13 May 86 LD] /12913

U.S. TO WITHDRAW CHEMICAL WEAPONS--[Trampe] Before the new binary chemical weapons are shipped to Europe, to the FRG, the FRG Government must be heard. Does that include a veto power, a right to object? [Woerner] Well, we have determined, together with the Americans, that new chemical weapons will only be allowed to enter our country with the FRG Government's approval. The old ones will be withdrawn, and they will be withdrawn from our territory by 1992 at the latest. This is the great success that Chancellor Kohl has had with President Reagan. [Interview with Defense Minister Manfred Woerner by correspondent Gustav Trampe in Brussels on 22 May, on the "Heute" news program--recorded] [Text] [Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1700 GMT 22 May 86 DW] /12913

FRG DENIES UPGRADING CHEMICAL WEAPONS--Bonn, 21 May (DPA)--The Foreign Ministry in Bonn has described the accusations made by the GDR about the planned modernization of Western stocks of chemical weapons as unfounded and groundless. A Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out when questioned that the United States has adhered to a moratorium on chemical weapons since 1969. The Warsaw Pact has not followed this example but has expanded its offensive capability in this sphere over the last few years. [Text] [Hamburg DPA in German 1638 GMT 21 May 86/ 8309]

CSO: 5200/2698



## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### BEIJING REVIEW: WARSAW PACT PROPOSAL TIMELY

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English No 25, 23 Jun 86 p 13

[Article by Xin Zong]

[Text]

**N**ow that leaders of the seven-member Warsaw Pact closed their two-day summit in Budapest on June 11 with a major East-West troop reduction proposal, the United States and its NATO allies will have to sit down to scrutinize this arms reduction appeal before drafting their own version.

The Warsaw Pact proposal, which calls for an East-West troop reduction of 100,000 to 150,000 soldiers by each side over the next one or two years, a 25 percent cut in troop strength by the early 1990s, appears to be more dynamic than earlier proposals. It contains details of a general reduction call made by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on April 18 when he addressed the Socialist Unity Party Congress of Democratic Germany and suggested a definite timetable for the reductions.

The Warsaw Pact also broadened its former stand on disarmament by agreeing to verification measures for arms reduction, including on-site inspection of disarmament and troop reduction efforts.

The issue of verification has long been a sensitive point in the unproductive Vienna negotiations of the past 13 years.

Miklos Barity, deputy Hungarian foreign minister and secretary-general of the Pact, said at a press conference that the member states were prepared to introduce measures to monitor troop reductions through an "international consultative committee" with the participation of NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, interested neutral and non-aligned states, and other European countries.

Through NATO's eyes, however, the latest initiative—which to some extent reflects the wishes of Europeans who do not want to see an armed confrontation between the world's two biggest military blocs—would squeeze the US armed forces out of Europe while maintaining a strong Soviet military presence there.

It is evident that the proposed equal troop-cuts for both NATO and the Warsaw Pact would leave the Soviet Union with an advantage because the number of troops the Soviet Union now has stationed on the continent is much greater than that of the United States.

The United States has about 300,000 servicemen in Western Europe, but in Democratic Germany alone the Soviet Union has the same number of soldiers.

NATO may also consider it disappointing that the proposal fails to mention medium-range missiles positioned east of the Ural Mountains when it offered to withdraw the Soviet rockets installed in Democratic Germany and Czechoslovakia in exchange for the dismantling of US medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

Washington has repeatedly stated that any deal on missiles in Europe should take into account Soviet medium-range nuclear weapons based in Asia because these weapons may easily be moved into Europe in an emergency.

Despite all these differences, the proposal may signify a step towards agreement, particularly over issues such as verification.

According to reports from Brussels, a NATO spokesman said the Warsaw Pact proposals would be carefully considered. "It would

be wrong to comment on the details before these ideas have been properly studied. But we certainly welcome all constructive contributions towards our objective," the spokesman said. It is significant that he refrained from calling it a propaganda ploy.

West European countries are expected to probe further what they may believe are constructive points in the Warsaw Pact proposal.

Whether it can break the decade-old deadlock in East-West disarmament talks remains to be seen.

One thing appears to be certain: The proposal will put more pressure on the Reagan administration for some positive move towards disarmament as major NATO members, Great Britain included, are opposed to the US decision to scrap the SALT II agreement.

/9317

CSO: 5200/4046

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. PLANS 25 JUNE NEVADA TEST

### TASS Report

LD250658 Moscow TASS in English 0633 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS -- TASS News Analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

The United States is planning to explode another nuclear device at a Nevada testing site today. A spokesman for the U.S. Department of Energy said that a device codenamed Darwin with a yield of up to 150 kilotons was going to be exploded underground. It will be the 13th nuclear weapon test announced by the United States since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions last August and the third one this year. In this way Washington, defying broad protests from the American and world public, stubbornly refuses to follow the Soviet example and halt nuclear explosions.

The Soviet Union, it should be remembered, stands for the immediate beginning of talks on a total nuclear test ban. Recently General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev reiterated his proposal on an immediate meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan to reach accord on a nuclear test ban. The decision to extend the moratorium to August 6 was not easy to take for the Soviet Union: The Americans carried out 12 nuclear tests since the moratorium went into effect.

But this decision shows how great the Soviet Union's conviction is of the need to achieve an early nuclear test ban.

A joint meeting of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet the other day approved a resolution suggesting a working meeting of Soviet parliamentarians and U.S. congressmen in the near future. Since a nuclear outbreak would pose a mortal threat not only to the USSR and the USA but to all countries, the commission considers it very important for Soviet and American parliamentarians unambiguously to state their will to avert the danger looming over the world and to oblige their governments to pursue a vigorous policy of peace, disarmament and settlement of contentious issues through negotiations.

The USSR and the socialist community proceed from the assumption that a nuclear test ban is the command of the times. The socialist countries' position is supported by non-aligned and neutral states. The time has come to go from words to action, to preserve peace, to stop the arms race and to end nuclear testing.

'Staking on Sheer Force'

LD242257 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The United States has officially announced its plan to carry out a routine nuclear weapons test tomorrow at the test site in Nevada. Here is a commentary by our Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver.

This new blast in Nevada, if it really does take place, will already be the 6th one this year and the 13 since the Soviet Union announced its moratorium on all nuclear blasts. These figures, which are ominous enough by themselves, graphically show the policy difference of the two powers. As was emphasized at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum and at the session of the Supreme Soviet that has adopted our new 5-year plan, the Soviet Union calls for the strengthening of universal peace and for broad international cooperation; it suggests a concrete program for providing universal security, removing all kinds of weapons of mass destruction and reducing conventional arms.

U.S. leaders, on the contrary, are staking on sheer force, on the nuclear fist, and on a terroristic piracy heavily infused with ideological intolerance. This gives rise to an essential difference in practical actions of both states, such as the prolongation of the moratorium on nuclear tests by the Soviet Union and more new nuclear blasts in Nevada. These Nevada blasts are dangerous not only because radiation leaks have occurred in the same Nevada site more than once, but also, to no lesser degree, because they are whipping up the arms race and are leading to the appearance of new kinds of weapons that are more and more devastating, both on earth and in space.

This time those in Washington are not concealing the new tests in Nevada are connected with the implementation of the star wars program. It is no mere coincidence that the Pentagon's boss took up arms against those congressmen who have dared to cut down on allocations for the notorious Strategic Defense Initiative. Meanwhile, the latest decisions by Congress, in particular its demand that the President observe the Soviet-American treaty on the restriction of strategic arms, are perceived by me as very symptomatic. They reflect the growth of concern over the adventurous Washington course not only in other countries but in the United States itself.

I recall that our country has recently taken new steps facilitating a search for mutually acceptable accords at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. If the United States ignores our initiatives once again and replies to them with new nuclear blasts, it will become obvious that the present Washington administration is conducting a mean game in a most serious issue on which the future of mankind depends.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1439

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA: U.S. BLOCKING CREATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIA NFZ

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 86 p 5

[Article by Dmitriy Kosyrev: "A Pressing Idea"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] A. Peskov from Moscow asks about the declarations in the ASEAN countries in favor of creating a nuclear-free zone in South East Asia.

The proposal to declare Southeast Asia a zone free of nuclear weapons has already long attracted the attention of the peoples in states of the region. Back in 1968, Malaysia advanced the concept of creating a zone of peace there. In 1971 the concept received the support of all the ASEAN nations, which now includes Brunay, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines. Back then it was proposed that deploying foreign military bases in this zone should be prohibited and the production, delivery and testing of nuclear weapons banned.

Today only three nuclear-free zones have so far been created on the planet. One was declared in Latin America, in accordance with the (Tlatelolco) treaty, concluded in Mexico in 1967. Another is in Antarctica (Washington, 1959). The third is in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean (Avarua, 1985).

As far as Southeast Asia is concerned, in this region are found not only the ASEAN countries, but also Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. These three states also have advanced the concept of a peace zone and they also defend the idea of a nuclear-free zone. During the 1960's and 1970's the flames of Washington's aggressive war against the countries of Indochina burned, into which many states were drawn to one extent or another. Yes, today as well the situation there is far from quiet. Tension on the Kampuchea-Thailand border is not ebbing. Two major U. S. military bases in the Philippines are operating actively where, according to much evidence, nuclear weapons are stored. Yes, Southeast Asia, according to the widespread opinion of the peoples populating this region, needs guarantees of stable peace and good neighborliness. The creation of a nuclear-free zone there could be an important contribution to solving this problem. It is well known that the USSR also favors forming such zones, since it narrows the sphere of nuclear preparations. Recently this idea has begun to resound with new force in the ASEAN capitals. It was supported in September 1984 at the session of the



association standing committee in Kuala Lumpur. And in recent months it has been discussed actively in Indonesia and Malaysia. Recently David Lange, Prime Minister of New Zealand, visited Djakarta. According to press reports, he and his Indonesian hosts discussed in detail the status of the agreement signed in Avarua. The Indonesian side seemed to be fitting the agreement to Southeast Asia. After the visit of New Zealand's Premier, Djakarta declared its desire to conclude such a treaty in its own region as well.

However, thus far not all ASEAN states are speaking in support of the creation of a nuclear-free zone. As the Indonesian minister of foreign affairs acknowledged, a number of countries still need to be convinced of the need for such a step, "since they are linked by military commitments with major powers."

As for the "major powers," this refers in the first place to the U. S. And Washington's position on this question is utterly clear. Washington under no circumstances plans to remove its bases from the Philippines. Moreover, obvious attempts are being undertaken to restore the American military presence in Thailand. This week, for example, U. S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger arrived in Bangkok and held negotiations there about creating American strategic supply depots in that country in case of "emergencies."

For the peoples of the ASEAN countries the increased interest in the question of creating a nuclear-free zone in the region is no accident. The struggle against the nuclear threat is growing throughout the world, and last year a nuclear-free zone was created literally at the border of Indonesia, in the south of the Pacific Ocean. The desire to bar the path to nuclear weapons and secure a truly peaceful future for Southeast Asia is being felt there more and more strongly.

9069

CSO: 5200/1397

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### USSR: NORTH KOREA PROPOSES NUCLEAR-FREE PENINSULA

#### Government Statement Cited

PM241349 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 86 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "DPRK Government Statement"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 23 Jun -- The DPRK Government has issued a statement in which it proposes that the Korean peninsula be transformed into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace. The DPRK, the document notes, has acceded to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, is honestly fulfilling the obligations imposed by the treaty, and consistently favors the elimination of nuclear weapons from South Korea.

The United States has transformed the south of the Korean peninsula into one of its major nuclear bases in the Far East. Washington has openly declared its intention to use nuclear weapons here.

In the prevailing conditions, the DPRK deems it necessary to adopt urgent measures aimed at averting nuclear war and ensuring lasting peace on the peninsula. The DPRK Government pledges that it will not test, produce, import, or site nuclear weapons on its territory or sanction the transportation of nuclear weapons through it. The United States must stop importing new types of nuclear weapons into South Korea, gradually withdraw all arms sited there, and renounce all plans to employ them in Korea. As for the DPRK, it is ready to enter into talks with the United States and South Korea on these questions.

The statement says that the DPRK Government and the Korean people will continue to do everything for the sake of peace in Korea, Asia, and throughout the world.

#### U.S. Response Viewed

LD242356 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Vladimir Korolev commentary]

[Text] In its circulated statement the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposes concrete measures to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone. The step is very timely. The United States, which has actually occupied South Korea, has turned it into a nuclear springboard. According to certain reports which Washington doesn't at all deny there are up to 1,000 nuclear charges at American bases

in the country at present and there are also delivery vehicles and they can at any moment be put into action. This, too, Washington doesn't attempt to conceal. Being aware of the danger that menaces not only Korea but also the neighboring peaceful countries, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has called on the United States not to introduce new types of nuclear weapons into South Korea but to withdraw, stage by stage, the nuclear weapons already deployed there. As for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, it pledges not to produce, use or permit the deployment of nuclear weapons on its territory and is ready to begin talks on the issue with Washington and Seoul.

The new peace initiatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea opens the way to easing tension on the Korean peninsula and eventually leads to implementing the cherished desire of all Koreans who want to see their country unified.

Every time when putting forth constructive proposals aimed at unifying Korea on a peaceful and democratic principle, Pyongyang underlines that the problem can be settled only if all American troops and their arms are withdrawn from the south of the country. However so far Washington and Seoul have responded to those moves by Pyongyang, which are in the interests of both the Korean and other peoples of the Far East by turning them down and by increasing military provocations on the Korean peninsula and nearby regions.

Such are the two policies in the Asian and Pacific area. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the other socialist countries seek to prevent a nuclear threat while the United States and its allies, on the contrary, are whipping up tension in that vast area of the world.

#### PRC In Favor

LD260713 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] China has backed a proposal by the Democratic People's Republics of Korea for making the Korean peninsula a nuclear free zone. A spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry Ma Yu Chen said in Peking the peace initiative meets the interests of all Koreans seeking peace and less tension on the peninsula. China, he said, has always believed the United States must withdraw its troops and armaments, including nuclear weapons, from South Korea.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1439

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### BRIEFS

SPD/SED TALKS--30 May (DPA)--The 2-day talks of a working group of SPD and SED on a nuclear weapons-free zone in central Europe ended on Friday in Bonn without noticeable progress. The two delegation leaders Bahr (SPD) and Axen (SED) spoke after the fourth round of negotiations of "intensive and businesslike talks." The talks are to be continued on 30 June in East Berlin. [Text] [Hamburg DPA in Germany 1105 GMT 30 May 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2698

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA ON GORBACHEV GENEVA PROPOSALS, WARSAW PACT APPEAL

PM241207 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[Pavel Demchenko: "International Review"]

[Excerpt] The Main Aim

There are dates which people never forget. Time and oblivion have no power over them. One such day was 22 June 1941. The reader will remember: Exactly 45 years ago, as the shortest summer night was drawing to a close, war, a brutal and bloody war such as mankind had never known before, hit our country.

Before Soviet people won the great victory over Hitlerite fascism, which raised its sword against our motherland, they had to live through 1,418 days and nights of hell. And, subsequently, it still took just over 3 months to complete the rout of Japanese militarism and to draw the bottom line under the tragedy of World War II. The war claimed more than 50 million lives in many countries and turned cities, settlements, and villages into ruins...

The memory of these sacrifices and suffering is indelible. It compels us to ponder the lessons of history again and again and to contemplate the danger that is now intensifying over the planet, threatening the very existence of mankind. The harsh reality of our time demands that we seek the most effective means of averting catastrophe, returning the world to the times of detente, and firmly establishing the principles of broad cooperation between countries and people.

It is highly symbolic that only this week another appeal to the world rang out from Moscow: A specific and realistic program for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security was set forth. This took place at the CPSU Central Committee plenum. M.S. Gorbachev's report was devoted to both domestic and foreign policy problems and summed up the results of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee which was held in Budapest.

As the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted, all the comrades in Budapest agreed that the situation in the world remains complex and that there are as yet no grounds to speak of a relaxation of tension. The prospect of a relaxation of tension is viewed in the West, and above all by the reactionary U.S. ruling clique, as a threat to their interests. During the past few months and weeks we have witnessed a series of rejections of Soviet proposals pertaining to cardinal questions of present-day development -- the refusal to end nuclear explosions; the abandonment of existing accords on strategic weapons; and the refusal to keep space free from weapons.



The point is that the imperialist states' ruling circles regard the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union as a mighty obstacle to the implementation of their imperial plans aimed at achieving world supremacy and social revenge. Furthermore, they entertain the hope, albeit illusory, that they may be able to thwart the implementation of our creative plans, to hamper the development of the socialist countries, to throw us off the course mapped out by the 27th CPSU Congress, and to keep us in the fetters of the arms race.

Following these dangerous plans remains Soviet foreign policy's main aim. The socialist countries will never allow the United States to gain nuclear missile superiority. The fate of the world must not be left in imperialism's hands. That would mean only one thing -- sliding toward nuclear war.

In these complex conditions, the USSR and the fraternal countries are not allowing themselves to be dragged onto the path of deepening confrontation, and they consider it their duty to persistently continue their quest for opportunities to reduce arms and improve the international situation, in particular in Europe, which has already lived through the nightmare of two world wars and where major armies and arms, including nuclear arms, are now concentrated. Allow me to recall in this context that the highlight, so to speak, of the Budapest meeting was the proposal on the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces throughout Europe from the Atlantic to the Ural.

It is a question of a 25 percent reduction of both sides' armed forces within the next few years. This refutes the speculative argument that nuclear disarmament in Europe would supposedly leave the West European states at a disadvantage if the present level of conventional armed forces were to be maintained.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum adopted a resolution on the results of the Political Consultative Committee conference, which expresses the conviction that the "friendship and cohesion of the fraternal socialist countries and the further development of their collaboration with all peace-loving states and broad public forces will lead to the further buildup of socialism's peace offensive and the establishment of international cooperation with a view to achieving mutually acceptable accords in the sphere of arms limitation for the sake of the development and progress of all mankind."

What was the reaction abroad to the plenum materials? It is possible to say without exaggeration that it was tremendous. The decisions of our party's Central Committee do, of course, always attract much attention among politicians and the international public. After all, it is the ruling party of the world's first and most powerful socialist state whose policy has a tremendous impact on world developments. However, this time there is special interest both because this was the first Central Committee plenum after the 27th congress, which approved an innovative program for our society's accelerated development, and also because the international situation is so acute: People the world over are interested in Moscow's policy in the face of the provocative actions undertaken by Washington and its closest NATO allies.

The main view expressed by the foreign press is this: The Soviet Union is fully resolved to accelerate its progress along the path of socioeconomic development and is persistently translating its peace initiatives into reality.

After the plenum a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held which approved the State Plan for the country's economic and social development in 1986-1990; this session was followed by a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commissions. During this meeting alarm was expressed in connection with the U.S. Administration's decision to abandon observance of Soviet-American strategic arms limitation agreements, and Washington's claims that the Soviet Union does not comply with the obligations it has assumed were resolutely rejected. The adopted resolution proposes that a working meeting be held in the near future between members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress foreign affairs bodies, and it expresses the hope that the U.S. Administration will reconsider all the consequences that its announced decision would entail and take steps which will help to stop mankind from sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe.

It goes without saying that, now as before, what is important is the U.S. side's answer. The next few days will tell what kind of an answer it is.

/9738

CS0: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: U.S. ADMINISTRATION SHOULD HEED 'LESSONS' OF WAR

PM241623 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jun 86 Second Edition p 5

[Journalist's notes by A. Leontyev: "Remember in Order To Live"]

[Excerpts] They say that what is important is not what we experience but what we remember. The war left a considerable number of bitter and glorious dates in our memories. One of them is 22 June 1941.

We have not forgotten that tragic day -- the first day of the war that was forced on us, a day deafened by the savage whine of enemy planes, the explosion of bombs and shells, and the dying cries of women and children.

The tragedy of 1941 must not be repeated. The historical dispute between capitalism and socialism can and must be resolved by peaceful capitalism and socialism can and must be resolved by peaceful competition between the two systems, resolved by the peoples themselves. All disputes between states also can find their solution by political means alone. The time when rivals used clubs is past. Mankind has developed, matured, and grown sufficiently wise not to get into a fight, especially a nuclear one. President J. Kennedy spoke well when he said: "We have no need for a victory with radioactive ash in our mouths." If there were more than 50 million victims in World War II, the whole of mankind would perish in the event of a nuclear conflagration.

Past experience shows that gentlemen who have never smelled gunpowder are often particularly bellicose. It is simply amazing how easily the United States discusses a "first nuclear strike," "limited" and "unlimited" nuclear wars, and particle beam, laser, and chemical weapons, and how quickly it yields to anti-Soviet propaganda claiming that all Russians are bad and all Americans good.

People of my generation remember how the German "Fuehrer" began his "approach" to World War II with demands that the outcome of World War I be revised, with highflown speeches about "human rights" and "peoples oppressed by Bolshevism," and, of course, his "desire for peace." Is it possible that this coincidence embarrasses no one in Washington? No one wants to tar different people with the same brush, but nevertheless a certain similarity exists. And, it must be said, a dangerous similarity.

The American Administration does not wish to reckon with either the lessons of the war or the realities of the nuclear age. It is prepared to set the house on fire as long as it can fry itself an egg. The present master of the White House has called for a new "crusade" against the USSR, threatened to leave communism "on the rubbish heap of

After the plenum a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held which approved the State Plan for the country's economic and social development in 1986-1990; this session was followed by a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commissions. During this meeting alarm was expressed in connection with the U.S. Administration's decision to abandon observance of Soviet-American strategic arms limitation agreements, and Washington's claims that the Soviet Union does not comply with the obligations it has assumed were resolutely rejected. The adopted resolution proposes that a working meeting be held in the near future between members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress foreign affairs bodies, and it expresses the hope that the U.S. Administration will reconsider all the consequences that its announced decision would entail and take steps which will help to stop mankind from sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe.

It goes without saying that, now as before, what is important is the U.S. side's answer. The next few days will tell what kind of an answer it is.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1445

history," and launched an unprecedented arms race and campaign of anti-Soviet lies and slander. The most recent months and weeks have seen a series of U.S. rejections of Soviet proposals on cardinal problems of world development: a refusal to stop nuclear tests; a rejection of existing arms accords; a refusal to leave space free of weapons. How can all this be explained?

The Soviet initiatives are regarded across the ocean as a powerful obstacle to the fulfillment of their imperial plans aimed at world domination and social revenge. As stressed at the CPSU Central Committee June plenum, our main foreign policy aim must be to foil these dangerous plans. Together with fraternal socialist countries we have proposed and will continue to propose every possible measure to preserve and strengthen peace. Millions of friends and all the world's peace-loving forces are on our side.

It is time to forget the past, our enemies say. For what reason? So that it will be easier to push mankind into the abyss of a new war -- that is what the United States and NATO believe. We have no need of war. Memory is our weapon in the struggle for a cloudless sky over the world. The weapon of millions of workers and of all reasonable, honest people. We must remember the past in order to preserve our planet. Remember in order to live.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1445



## RELATED ISSUES

### SOVIET MILITARY PAPER ON U.S. SSBN, SURFACE NAVAL PROGRAMS

PM191330 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 86 Second Edition p 5

[G. Sturua article: "The Spearhead of Military Adventures; U.S. Navy -- Instrument of Aggressive Policy"]

[Text] The markings on the deck aircraft on the U.S. nuclear aircraft carrier Nimitz are the pirate emblem -- skull and crossbones. Crude force, overt brigandage, and misanthropy are advocated and preached in the United States increasingly blatantly. However, what is characteristic in this case that the pirate emblem used by the aircraft of one aircraft carrier could, with good reason, serve as the emblem of the entire U.S. Navy.

The Navy is traditionally used by Washington as the assault echelon in all kinds of military adventures and acts of state terrorism. Admiral Watkins, former chief of staff of the U.S. Navy, admitted that "between 1946 and 1982 on approximately 250 occasions when U.S. Armed Forces were used, the naval forces were the main factor in our response in approximately 80 percent of crisis situations." He added: "Although we are not in a war situation, the scale of our operations is approximately 20 percent higher than during the years of the Vietnam war."

In its pursuit of military superiority Washington is building up its naval forces on an unprecedented scale. Thus, according to the press, the Pentagon is planning to increase the size of the Navy from the present 540 combat units [boyevyye yedinitsy] to more than 600 by the end of the current decade. The number of aircraft carrier groups is to be increased from 13 to 15. The political blessing to this abrupt leap in the naval arms race was given at the highest level during the commissioning ceremony for the battleship New Jersey: "Superiority at sea," the head of the White House said, "is a must for us... We must be able to control air, surface, and submarine space so as to ensure our access to all the world's oceans."

However, the purely quantitative increase of the fleet of U.S. warships is only one side of the militarist coin. The other side being the qualitative changes in the nature of the tasks assigned to the U.S. Navy. According to a statement by the Pentagon chief, a paramount task of the Navy henceforth will be not only operations in sea lanes but also strikes against land targets.

For more than quarter of a century now the task of delivering strikes from the sea against the territory of the opponent was assigned to nuclear missile submarines (SSBN's). As is known, they are part of the strategic forces and come under a different "department," so to speak, as the marine component of the so-called strategic "triad." Equipped with long-range, high-precision missiles, the SSBN's have become a first-strike

weapon system. This system gets extensive coverage in the press. I would like to point out that the 1987 budget makes provision for the appropriation of means for the construction of an Ohio class submarine missile carrier, the 14th. The Pentagon is also expecting to obtain the means needed by the Navy to purchase Trident-2 missiles, with which missile submarines are to be equipped beginning in 1989. The Pentagon intends to build a total of 20 Ohio class SSBN's of which, according to the press, 7 are already in service.

Implementing the program for the so-called "nuclear rearmament" of America, the present U.S. Administration is equipping not only its strategic forces but also its general purpose forces including the Navy with new combat means at an accelerated rate.

Suffice it to say that in 1983 the Navy accounted for 2,765 (25.5 percent) of the 10,820 various nuclear munitions in the arsenal of the general purpose forces, according to foreign press reports. In the assessment of foreign military experts, around 250 warships of the general purpose forces are nuclear-equipped or nuclear-capable. They include 13 aircraft carriers, 3 battleships, 28 cruisers, around 70 destroyers, 60 frigates, and 75 multipurpose nuclear submarines. It is assumed that an aircraft carrier can carry up to 140 nuclear munitions, and a cruiser or destroyer up to 20.

Here it must be emphasized that among the various types of nuclear weapons with which the U.S. Navy is equipped, the Tomahawk nuclear cruise missiles are beginning to play an increasingly important role. As Admiral Hostettler, in charge of the program to equip the Navy with cruise missiles, has said, the Tomahawks represent an important nuclear weapon in the U.S. arsenal that adds new qualities to naval warfare. It is a question here of the Pentagon's endeavor to increase the potential of the general purpose forces by means of the cruise missiles, to turn these forces into a substantial reserve and, essentially, into a component of the strategic means. According to the foreign press, the U.S. Navy is planning to have around 4,000 cruise missiles by the beginning of the 1990's, including 758 nuclear-tipped cruise missiles. It is planned to increase the number of ships equipped with cruise missiles to 75-200 within the next few years.

Another type of mass destruction weapon the Pentagon is planning to use to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union at sea are chemical weapons. The well-known program for "chemical modernization" applies to all branches of the armed forces, including the Navy. And, as the Western press notes, it is especially ominous that the Pentagon seeks to equip not just warships but also transport ships with chemical weapons.

The tempestuous quantitative buildup of the fleet of warships and their equipment with mass destruction weapons is accompanied by a reinforcement of the offensive, aggressive postulates of the notorious U.S. "ocean strategy." The old thesis "he who rules the seas, rules the world" proclaimed back at the end of the last century by the ideologist of U.S. imperialism Admiral Mahan is given concrete expression in the aggressive foreign policy course of contemporary America. Thus, the aforementioned Admiral Watkins in a report on U.S. naval strategy importunately calls for containment "at the brink of war." It abounds in expressions such as "show of strength," "embark on destruction," "engage in neutralization."

The latest piratical actions of the U.S. armada, including three aircraft carriers, near the Libyan coast show that these words are not just rhetoric. Every unprejudiced person regards Washington's blatantly piratical actions with respect to Libya as the concrete implementation of the doctrine of "neoglobalism" which envisages U.S. interference in the

affairs of sovereign states and the kindling of tension in various parts of the world. The most dangerous instrument of this interference are the U.S. Armed Forces and in particular the Navy, which operates as the spearhead in military adventures and has earned for itself the infamous nickname imperialism's "floating gendarme."

A most important contribution to the improvement of the international atmosphere could be made by ending the arms race on the seas and in the oceans, by limiting naval activity. The USSR has repeatedly expressed its readiness to reach an agreement with the United States on the mutual limitation of naval operations and the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans. The blame for the fact that these questions have so far not been properly resolved falls squarely on the United States.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW COMMENTARY ON DIFFERENT DISARMAMENT APPROACHES

OW232247 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 17 Jun 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Aleksandr Serikov commentary: "Two Approaches to Problems of Peace and Disarmament"]

[Text] Hello, comrades. As Comrade Gorbachev emphasized in his report at the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum, frustrating the aggressive designs of the ruling imperialist circles must be the main goal of our foreign policy. The peaceful steps that have been undertaken by our country are known. These include the plan for eliminating nuclear weapons by the year 2000, our moratorium on nuclear explosions, and the proposal on the destruction of chemical weapons. All these and other Soviet initiatives are aimed at improving the world climate.

However, the prospects for relaxing tensions in international affairs are being perceived in the West, first of all by the U.S. reactionary ruling clique, as a threat to the realization of their imperialist designs of universal supremacy.

This is exactly what has caused the series of rejections to the Soviet proposals on the principal problems of contemporary development: the refusal to end nuclear experiments, the rejection of existing agreements on strategic weapons, and the refusal to leave outer space free of weapons. As the report noted, the U.S. leaders continue to assess the contemporary international situation using star wars, nuclear warheads, the arms race, and militarist blackmail as a yardstick, thereby increasingly undermining the security of the whole world as well as that of their own country.

Everything demonstrates that the world situation remains complex, and there are, so far, no grounds for talking about the relaxation of tensions. Such is the conclusion reached by the participants of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact member-states.

The confident voice of Moscow has again sounded on this uneasy, troubled situation. The USSR, declared Comrade Gorbachev at the CPSU Central Committee plenum, will persistently continue to carry out its initiatives, which answer the innermost hopes of our people and all people on the planet. Our country will not permit an intensification of the military-political confrontation to be forced on mankind, which would mean a slide to nuclear war. We shall never permit U.S. nuclear missile superiority, was the plenum's message. In this, our Leninist foreign policy course and our defensive might are supported by the reliable basis of the acceleration of social and economic development that the party has worked out.

/9738  
CSO: 5200/1445

14 July 1986

## RELATED ISSUES

## MOSCOW, CHINA VOW NO-FIRST-USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

OW150304 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Leonidov commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: 15 June is the fourth anniversary of the Soviet declaration not to use nuclear weapons first. Of the five nuclear powers, only two -- the Soviet Union and China -- have undertaken this obligation. The United States and two other Western nuclear powers have obstinately refused to follow the example of our two socialist countries. Please listen to the following commentary by our station observer Leonidov:

The nuclear threat is a grim reality of our times. The United States is the country to develop and use nuclear weapons, as well as the leader in the nuclear arms race. Therefore, it is the chief culprit of the danger of the threat of a nuclear holocaust. I would also like to remind you that the United States is the only nuclear power that possesses a nuclear arsenal outside its territory -- in Western Europe, the Far East, and the Indian Ocean region. Major socialist centers in Europe and Asia and developing countries on all continents are perpetually the target for the U.S. nuclear guided missiles.

The fact that the U.S. ruling clique has refused to undertake the obligation not to use nuclear weapons first has aroused the deep concern of people all over the world. They urge the Washington authorities to follow the noble example of the Soviet Union and China in formally acknowledging the principle not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

As is universally known, the principal demand of the worldwide antinuclear movement is to stop nuclear tests. As early as last year, the 40th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombing of Japan's Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Soviet Union unilaterally declared its readiness to stop all nuclear tests and proposed that a treaty on ending nuclear tests be signed between the United States and the Soviet Union. So far, the Soviet Union has postponed the period for its unilateral end to nuclear tests three times and has not carried out any test in the past 9 months.

People all over the world have responded positively to the Soviet proposal for ending nuclear tests, first bilaterally, and then multilaterally by all nuclear powers. However, the U.S. aggressive clique has never retreated from its policy of manufacturing more advanced nuclear weapons and expanding its nuclear arsenal. In the 9 months since the Soviet Union unilaterally stopped nuclear tests, the United States has carried out 12 nuclear tests in Nevada, including 5 this year. Furthermore, as you know, these



tests were directly related to the U.S. plan to develop offensive space weapons. The Soviet Union, China, and many other countries have demanded that under no circumstances should space militarization be allowed to become a reality. However, the U.S. ruling clique has turned a deaf ear to these rational views.

Dear listeners, according to reports, Hu Yaobang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, reiterated at a London press conference that China favors a universal ban and the complete destruction of nuclear and chemical weapons, and opposes the militarization of space. It is very important that our two socialist countries share identical views on these major issues of our times. This has provided broad possibilities for concerted action by the Soviet Union and China in the struggle to eliminate the nuclear threat and ensure lasting and stable peace in Asia and the world as a whole.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: CARRINGTON PRESSURES NORWAY ON SDI, ARMS SPENDING, NFZ

LD241359 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Oslo, 24 Jun (TASS)--Lord Carrington, the NATO secretary-general, arrived here for a four-day unofficial visit.

Local observers are of the opinion that during his talks with Johan Holst, minister of defense of Norway, Knut Frydelund, minister of foreign affairs of Norway, and other officials, Lord Carrington will press for a change in the stand of the Norwegian Government which refused to support unconditionally President Reagan's "star wars" plans at the session of the NATO Military Planning Committee held last May at the level of defense ministers.

The headquarters of the North Atlantic alliance is annoyed at Oslo's reluctance to increase its military budget by 7 percent a year, as required by the directives of the NATO command. It is also displeased with the basic principles of Norway's foreign policy which does not allow the construction of foreign military bases and the deployment of nuclear weapons on the country's territory in peacetime.

It follows from Lord Carrington's statement made to a group of Norwegian journalists on the eve of his departure for Oslo that the NATO leadership was seriously concerned over what he called a certain shift of priorities in Norway's foreign policy after the Norwegian Labor Party had come to power in the country last May.

The NATO secretary-general did not bother to conceal that he was going to bring pressure to bear on the government which did not want to follow blindly the instructions given to it by the North Atlantic alliance.

We should do everything possible to ensure full backing of different proposals by the NATO countries, Lord Carrington said.

The NATO secretary-general reiterated his negative stand on the idea of establishing a nuclear free zone in Nordic Europe. In his words, the idea of nuclear free-zone is at variance with NATO's general strategy.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1445

## RELATED ISSUES

### SOVIET SCIENTISTS ON NUCLEAR WAR EFFECTS ON BIOSPHERE

Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 86 p 3

[Article by Vladimir Lvov: "The Fate of the Human Race." For the Full Text of Goldanskiy's Article, see the USSR REPORT: TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No 1, January 1986, JPRS-UKO-86-008, 21 Apr 86, pp 107-118]

[Text] When the leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Sweden, Tanzania and Greece appealed recently to the leaders of the two great nuclear powers, an unco concealed alarm could be heard in this appeal. "We are all living," they wrote, "confronted by the most terrible possibility of our destruction in a nuclear conflagration." We all, it stated further, appeal to you "to do everything possible to avert this threat..."

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev answered this appeal with portentous words. Yes, "today the fate of the human race itself has been placed in question." And the next day in answer to French professor (Harois) he repeated this thought still more clearly and sharply: "If we step over this line (in the arms race), life on earth will hang by a thread, which may be broken at any instant..."

It is known how this unprecedented situation in human history arose.

It was created by the arms race unleashed by imperialism and the stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. Research by Soviet and American scholars has shown with mind chilling clarity where a massive exchange of missiles would lead. "Nuclear winter" was what the abyss was named into which the mad militarists are prepared to push mankind. "Nuclear winter" means the smoke from enumerable fires and the black dust which will blanket the earth's atmosphere for long weeks and months. Haze and cold will reign from the equator to the poles over the whole planet. The stream of solar rays will decline to a level fatal to vegetation. Animals and people will be left without food. Hunger and illnesses will cut down those who did not perish in the first minutes.

Is this not enough? But no, as if jeering at the human race, those who contemplate nuclear slaughter add to this terrible picture the satanic "Star Wars" program. If they are successful in implementing it, it will threaten to turn not only the earth's air and water, but even near-earth space into hell!

Recently the theoretician of nuclear plunder, the not unknown Edward Teller, shared with his listeners in one of the subcommittees of the American Congress this comforting thought. The sense of it boils down to the view that even if life disappears from the face of the earth for some period of time, it will be "nothing terrible." Some seeds and embryos will remain, he says. Some human specimens (Teller, apparently, has in mind himself and people from his high station) will stay for a time in super-deep bunkers and mines. There they will look around, everything will settle down, the sun will be seen again, everything will start to turn green, and it will be possible to begin the tale anew!

You are mistaken, Mr. Teller. Most unfortunately, you are mistaken. Nothing will turn green any longer, and you will have to spend out the rest of your days in your bunker.

In front of me are recent 1985 issues of "Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences," issued periodically, which publish the most important works of Soviet physicists, biologists and specialists in other natural sciences. And so important is the research about which we are speaking that its results were published by KOMMUNIST, the theoretical and political journal of the Central Committee of our Party, in an article by academician V. I. Goldanskiy in this year's first edition.

This is how academician Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy formulates the final conclusion of his research:

"The super-powerful additional racemic effects of weapons of mass destruction may represent a special danger...IT WOULD MEAN THE COMPLETE, DEFINITIVE DISAPPEARANCE OF THE BIOSPHERE. THE LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLANET WOULD BE THROWN BACK BILLIONS OF YEARS!"

Racemic effects?

The term is not used in everyday life. The term is understood only by a narrow circle of specialists. But a leading Soviet scientist explained precisely this term, loudly and within earshot of all, in connection with the most burning question of our time. It is precisely with this term that the new and ominous threat has been linked which has now been added to the terrible threat hanging over life on the planet.

People of good will in all countries, who look with alarm at the machinations of the nuclear maniacs, must think about this term.

We must decipher it.

The research undertaken by a group of scientists headed by academician Goldanskiy began with a circle of questions seemingly far from the problems troubling mankind.

We will be talking about one the peculiarities of certain complex chemical compounds. All of them consist, as is known, of particles (molecules),

identical for every substance. But there are cases when among the molecules of one and the same substance examples occur which are slightly different in the "sketch" of their structure. Specifically, one type of molecule differs in these cases from another in the way an article differs from its reflection in a mirror, or a left handed glove differs from a right-handed glove.

Figuratively speaking, the structure of some molecules is distorted from right to left, and that of others from left to right. At first glance the difference is not great, but the consequences may be immeasurably great.

These and other molecules (we call them "left" and "right" molecules) are most often intermingled in equal numbers. And their mixture chemists call racemic.

We have met here, consequently, the same term which sounded so alarming several lines above. Let us see where this threat leads us.

All living organisms, as biochemists long ago explained, are structured from substances with molecules of only one "mirror" form. This is related most of all to the main chemical foundation of life -- proteins and nucleic acids (the celebrated DNA and RNA). This circumstance is decisive for life on the planet! For it is only from elements of identical "left" form that long chains characteristic of earth's protein molecules can be constructed. And in exactly the same way, only the identical "leftness" of elements of DNA molecules can provide for forming this molecule with its twisted, spiral features.

How did it happen, one might ask, that out of the disorderly mixture of "right" and "left" molecules in the lifeless natural environment, organisms could arise at all with absolutely identical molecular "mirror-surfaces?" What force billions of years ago sorted out some molecules from others and opened to way for living molecules?

This is the central mystery of the origin of life; the mystery which many generations of scientists struggled with for long years. The stake in terms of world outlook placed on its solution is too high. It is well known that any major hitch in scientific inquiry is always an occasion for speculations by reactionary ideologues. If no material cause for the phenomena is found, God is immediately presented as the reason.

Today with pride in Soviet materialist science we can say that the "central riddle" about which we are speaking is close to a solution. Theoretical research by the brilliant young scientist, L. L. Morozov, who died an untimely death in 1984, played a key role here. But now, in order not to be sidetracked, I will not discuss this topic and hope to return to it another time.

Now another aspect of the problem is of interest to us.

Normally people are surrounded by a biosphere; i.e., by plants and animals consisting from time immemorial of ideally pure substances (in the sense of the absence of racemic mixtures). We use them for food and the entire life cycle on the planet is based on this purity.



And life on earth will not survive if organic substances comprised of a racemic mixture of molecules mix with our food, water and air. That is, if molecules whose structure is not that required by living cells and tissues begin to invade organisms. The insidiousness of this trap is that by outward appearance and many features racemic products may not differ from "mirror" pure products. Both molecules seem identical. But the difference in the change in their structure will immediately have its effect. Molecules with an inappropriate "mirror-structure" will not be assimilated by the organisms. It is just as impossible as it is to try to screw a right-threaded screw into a left-threaded hole. Racemic food will not be of benefit. And, more than this, the presence of molecules of inappropriate orientation may have catastrophic consequences.

The tragic episode of thalidomide showed this. Nervous system calming tablets were manufactured in Western Europe under this name. No attention was paid to the fact that the medication was racemic; i.e., it contained equal numbers of "left" and "right" molecular structures. The result was tragic. The children of women who took thalidomide during pregnancy were born with physical deformities. Later it became clear that only one of the two types of molecule antipodes was responsible for the catastrophe.

But the thalidomide case is only a weak hint of what total militaristic mindlessness will bring mankind.

The gigantic whirlwind brought down upon the planet by the explosion of tens of megatons of nuclear explosives may have consequences extending not for months and years, but for hundreds of millions and billions of years. In this hellish whirlwind, academician Goldanskiy warns, "the total racemization of the environment may take place."

"In assessing the possibility of such a super-catastrophy," continues the author of the KOMMUNIST article, "it is necessary to understand clearly that we are not talking so much about simultaneous, super-powerful racemizing effects, as we are about the consequences of protracted action. Such a super-catastrophy may be characterized without exaggeration as complete collapse (destruction to nothingness -- V. L.) of life..."

Under these conditions, in order for life again to appear on earth, Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy writes, "it would be necessary to again pass through all the stages of pre-biological evolution of matter."

That is, an earth without life for hundreds of millions and billions of years. The speech by Comrade Gorbachev on 29 March over Soviet television again concentrated the attention of the whole world on the question of questions: How can we stop the arms race now, immediately? How can we bar the path to the mindless slide to the abyss which threatens to turn the planet earth into a lifeless desert of death?

Such a barrier today can come through halting all nuclear explosions.

When for our side it was declared that the Soviet Union would not conduct nuclear tests after 31 March until the first U. S. nuclear explosion, the world held its breath. The world awaited an answer from the other side to this noble, selfless act. It was selfless because by going almost eight months without nuclear testing, the Soviet Union bore definite and significant costs for the sake of peace on earth.

The world awaited an answer.

And an answer came. Impudently and crudely flouting the hopes of mankind, and throwing a challenge to the peoples, the militaristic mafia at the end of March exploded a 150 kiloton bomb on a range in Nevada and announced a new explosion to be carried out in April.

They answered.

The last word in this question of life and death for mankind, however, has not by any means been said. The last word will belong to the peoples of peace. As Comrade M. S. Gorbachev stated in his television address, "it is necessary to act together. This concerns each and every person."

Each and every one.

9069

CSO: 5200/1397

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

**30 JULY 1986**